

University Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan



Campus Partners



July, 1996

University Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan

**Concept Document
Policies, Recommendation and Programs**

July, 1996

Campus Partners

EDAW

**Barton-Aschman Associates, Inc.
Robert Charles Lesser and Co.
The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio
Williams Russell and Johnson, Inc.
Dr. Robert Friedmann/Dr. George Napper**

in association with

**NBBJ
Boulevard Strategies
Burgess & Niple, Ltd.**

This document represents a vision and set of principles to guide revitalization of the University Neighborhoods. It is not intended to be a detailed operating plan. Specific projects or initiatives are listed as examples; they do not represent funding commitments or endorsement by The Ohio State University, the city of Columbus or any other organization. Furthermore, enactment of the majority of this Plan's recommendations can only come after continued community and agency input through established public approval processes. Any commitments of funding or other resources by sponsoring organizations are subject to review and approval by their respective governing bodies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development of the Revitalization Plan has involved hundreds of people who have shared their experience and advice on how to improve the quality of life for those who live and work in the University District. In large and small public meetings during the past year, the Campus Partners consulting team has been impressed by the passion and commitment so many residents have for their neighborhoods. The citizens of the University District are understandably proud of their diversity. While this characteristic is clearly a strength, it also requires deliberate efforts by everyone to find common ground and work together to improve the quality of life for all. We thank the citizens of the University District for their participation in the development of this Plan, as well as many other individuals who contributed many hours and ideas.

E. Gordon Gee, president of The Ohio State University, and Greg Lashutka, mayor of Columbus, turned a shared concern for the vitality of the University District into an innovative partnership of city, university and neighborhood cooperation. Their leadership has encouraged outstanding participation by city and university staff.

Columbus City Council, led by President John Kennedy, has committed city resources to the planning process and has followed it closely. We appreciate the interest and advice of Council member Matt Habash, as the liaison with council, and Pete Cass, council's economic development coordinator. In the executive branch, George Arnold, director of the Department of Trade and Development, represents the city on the Campus Partners Board of Trustees and has been a valuable liaison with the city agencies throughout our planning process. While every city department involved was supportive, the Planning Division, led by Administrator Stephen McClary, and the Public Service Department, led by Director Thomas Merritt and Deputy Director Richard Hickman, offered generous assistance and advice. In addition, the initiative of the Public Service Department in improved trash collection and street cleaning underscored that behind this planning effort is a city commitment to action.

The university, like the neighborhoods, is not a single entity but a diverse group of constituencies. All of these constituencies have played valuable roles in the development of this plan. We appreciate the involvement of George Skestos as the principal liaison with the university's Board of Trustees. Nancy Zimpher, dean of the College of Education, and her faculty, staff and student colleagues with the Campus Collaborative for Educational Excellence has broadened and enriched the scope of this Revitalization Plan. The vision they offered for extending the university's academic mission will enhance the quality of life of residents and enrich the university's experience. Our thanks also go to David Williams II, vice president for the student affairs and chairman of the Campus Partners Board of Trustees; Jill Morelli, assistant vice president and university architect; Jean Hansford, senior campus planner; and Ben Brace, special assistant to the vice president for business and administration.

We appreciate the cooperation of many University District leaders. Pasquale Grado, consultant with the University Community Business Association, provided important historical information and a careful analysis of our early recommendations. We thank Mark Hatch, executive director of the Community Crime Control, for chairing Campus Partners' Safety Coordinating Committee. In addition, we thank the members of the University Area Commission, University District Organization, and University Community Association. For participation at the neighborhood level, we thank Weinland Park Community Collaborative, Dennison Place Association, NECKO, Neighbors in Action, Iuka Ravine Historic Association, Indianola Forest, North University Historic Association, Northwood Park Garden Club, North Columbus Block Watch, and Glen Echo South Civic Association.

Finally, we acknowledge the leadership and support of Barry Humphries as the founding president of Campus Partners and his staff. Barry assembled our team, developed around a comprehensive approach, encouraged wide public participation and careful review of alternatives, made sure the Plan was action oriented, and maintained the project's extremely aggressive schedule.

Campus Partners Staff

Barry Humphries, President (Past)
Joe Williams, Director of Real Estate & Treasurer (Past)
Steve Sterrett, Director of Community Relations
Debra Hatz, Administrative Assistant
Julie Boyland, Community Outreach Coordinator

Consulting Team

EDAW, Inc.

Prime Consultant and Project Managers
Planning and Urban Design

Robert Charles Lesser

Market Analysis

Barton-Aschman

Transportation Planning

The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio

Human Services

Williams Russell Johnson

Code Enforcement
Trash/Solid Waste Collection

Dr. Robert Friedmann and Dr. George Napper

Safety and Law Enforcement

NBBJ

Planning and Urban Design Support

Boulevard Strategies, Inc.

Market Analysis Support

Burgess & Niple

Utilities and Infrastructure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

6

Part I: INTRODUCTION

Revitalization Plan Purpose and Structure	15
Revitalization Plan Development	16
Revitalization Plan Goals, Vision, and Core Values	18

Part II: REVITALIZATION PLAN CONCEPTS

Plan Context	20
Planning Principals	22
Revitalization Plan Framework	24

Part III: POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Core Value #1: A Model for University-Community Relationships

1.0 Faculty Participation

Objectives	27
Policies and Recommendations	28
Setting and Current Issues	28
Programs and Concepts	30

Core Value #2: A Place of Pride

2.0 Code Enforcement

Objectives	31
Policies and Recommendations	32
Setting and Current Issues	32
Programs and Concepts	36

3.0 Parks and Greenways

Objectives	37
Policies and Recommendations	37
Setting and Current Issues	38
Programs and Concepts	39

4.0 Trash/Solid Waste Collection

Objectives	40
Policies and Recommendations	41
Setting and Current Issues	42
Programs and Concepts	44

Core Value #3: Cultural and Economic Diversity

5.0 Land Use and Zoning

Objectives	49
Policies and Recommendations	49
Setting and Current Issues	50
Programs and Concepts	52

6.0 Residential Revitalization

Objectives	56
Policies and Recommendations	56
Setting and Current Issues	59
Programs and Concepts	60

7.0 Health and Well-Being

Objectives	65
Policies and Recommendations	65
Setting and Current Issues	66
Programs and Concepts	66

8.0 Employment and Development

Objectives	67
Policies and Recommendations	68
Setting and Current Issues	68
Programs and Concepts	68

9.0 Student Quality of Life

Objectives	70
Policies and Recommendations	70
Setting and Current Issues	71
Programs and Concepts	72

Core Value #4: A Neighborhood of Choice**10.0 Safety and Law Enforcement**

Objectives	74
Policies and Recommendations	75
Setting and Current Issues	77
Programs and Concepts	81

11.0 Community Schools

Objectives	85
Policies and Recommendations	85
Setting and Current Issues	86
Programs and Concepts	87

12.0 Vehicular Circulation

Objectives	89
Policies and Recommendations	89
Setting and Current Issues	91
Programs and Concepts	93

13.0 Transportation Alternatives

Objectives	95
Policies and Recommendations	96
Setting and Current Issues	97
Programs and Concepts	97

14.0 Parking

Objectives	98
Policies and Recommendations	98
Setting and Current Issues	99
Programs and Concepts	101

Core Value #5: Demonstrate New Leadership**15.0 Commercial Revitalization**

Objectives	104
Policies and Recommendations	104
Setting and Current Issues	106
Programs and Concepts	110

Core Value #6: Active Participation and Individuals and Agencies**16.0 Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities**

Objectives	114
Policies and Recommendations	114
Required Commitments	115
Conclusion	116

Glossary 118**Bibliography 119**

Background

In September of 1994, The Ohio State University President, Dr. E. Gordon Gee, and Mayor Greg Lashutka of the city of Columbus announced a joint commitment to the revitalization of the area known as the University Neighborhoods. The impetus for the commitment came from a growing concern about the quality of life in the neighborhoods that are east and south of the Ohio State campus. A task force known as the University Area Improvement Task Force had been appointed in January of 1994 to study the issues and make recommendations. Representatives were chosen from the University faculty, staff and students, community organizations, and the city of Columbus. The task force recommendations that are the foundation of the September 1994 joint commitment include:

Creation of a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, which is known as the Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, an Ohio 1728 Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation. The organization was given two priorities for its first year of operations:

- To develop a comprehensive neighborhood Revitalization Plan (this document), accompanied by an Implementation Strategy; and
- To actively promote projects and programs that can have an immediate, positive impact on the Neighborhoods.

Campus Partners, with extensive community input, has directed a team of consultants in the preparation of the **University Neighborhoods Revitalization Concept Document** (Concept) and a planned companion volume, the **University Neighborhoods Implementation Strategy** (Strategy). The intent of the Concept is to be used as a decision-making tool for the city of Columbus, The Ohio State University, and neighborhood groups and commissions as they fulfill their respective responsibilities for managing or taking actions that affect the University District. The Concept establishes the *core values* of the revitalization process and presents a set of long-range objectives, policies, and recommendations that future actions should be directed to accomplish. The Strategy defines the specific actions, timing, responsible parties, and estimated costs for these improvements.

Location

The University Neighborhoods study area is a subset of the University District, a 2.5 square mile planning area approximately 2 miles directly north of downtown Columbus. The District's 1,500 acres are bounded by Glen Echo Ravine to the north, the Conrail corridor to the east, 5th Avenue to the south, and the Olentangy River to the west. The study area follows approximately the same boundaries but does not include any of the District north of Northwood Avenue, nor the area south of King Avenue and west of the alley directly behind High Street.

Problem Statement

Although the University District remains a vital center of activity for Columbus, it is failing to retain and attract homeowners and is losing its once-captive market position for students. Despite its abundance of affordable single and two-family housing stock and excellent location relative to the University and downtown Columbus, the District has experienced a tremendous drop in home ownership levels, from 50% in 1950 to just over 11% in 1990. At the same time, prospective students and their parents, especially high-ability students, are deciding not to attend Ohio State due to a setting that is perceived as disintegrating and unsafe. As the University District has lost students and homeowners, it has received a disproportionate share of federally subsidized Section 8 housing - 2,050 units with one neighborhood in the District claiming the highest concentration of Section 8 housing in the City.

Public safety and crime are also central concerns within the University District. In 1994, on a per capita basis, violent crime in the University District was 14.2 % higher than Columbus as a whole and property crime was 21.6% higher. The Weinland Park neighborhood, suffering from gang activity and illegal drug sales, had the highest per capita rate of violent crime in the city. Problems in the University District attracted statewide attention in 1994 with the murder of Ohio State freshman student Stephanie Hummer.

Other visible problems abound. A 20-year legacy of ineffective code enforcement coupled with the economic pressures of overzoning have led to inappropriate and poorly constructed renovations and dormitory style apartments. Extremely high densities coupled with insufficient public services have resulted in overflowing trash containers, unswept streets, and inadequate or overutilized park and recreational facilities.

The University Neighborhoods are entering a period where change must occur to ensure health and economic stability. Reversing the trends of disinvestment, declining homeownership, and loss of security are possible through the collaboration and mandate established by The Ohio State University and city of Columbus.

Comprehensive Planning Approach

Recognizing the complex nature of the problems in the Neighborhoods, the scope of the study effort involved research into issues that go far beyond physical changes. Restoring the health of a community is intrinsically linked to the resident's well-being and pride of place. Understanding the human services network and quality of life issues were a significant part of the study. An active partner in the planning process has been the Campus Collaborative, a consortium of colleges and academic units at The Ohio State University, and the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio. This unique collaborative is comprised of faculty and graduate students from seventeen different colleges and units of The Ohio State University. Additional input came from consultants who specialize in the areas of crime and law enforcement, code compliance, solid waste removal, economic revitalization, circulation and transportation, and urban design.

The University Neighborhood residents participated in the recommendations contained herein through extensive community workshops, task forces, neighborhood level meetings, and written comments. A community outreach program was undertaken to inform all interested residents, students, property owners, and others of the public meetings.

A third-party review of the early plan recommendations was performed through the auspices of the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) Inner-City Community Building Program. Conducted during one week in July of 1995, ULI members skilled in community revitalization confirmed the progress to date and made recommendations which are incorporated in the document.

Vision Statement and Core Values

Unlocking the potential of the University District and overcoming thirty years of inertia that has stalled past redevelopment efforts, requires a clear and consistent vision that engages both the principal partners charged with the redevelopment effort and the community at large. Working with a group of twenty leaders selected from the community, a vision statement was developed at a two-day workshop conducted in March of 1995. The intent of the workshop was to articulate a clear set of concepts, ideas, visions, and guiding principles which could be the foundation for all future recommendations and actions. The following vision statement and core values are the underpinning of the programs and recommendations in both the Concept and Strategy:

Vision Statement: *"The University District shall become a high quality 'city-within-a-city,' characterized by diverse, enriched, safe, livable, and commercially viable neighborhoods with community features and programs connected by a district-wide framework of transportation, open space, amenities, and human services."*

Core Values

The overall vision for the University District embodies six Core Values that serve as the organizing element for all recommendations and actions. Core Values are firmly held beliefs that establish the continuity between all future actions. The refinement of these Core Values has occurred over the nine-month planning process, shaped by public input and responses to the Revitalization Plan.

Core Value #1: *The University District shall be a model for University-community relationships:*

- by optimizing University investment in the community according to a mutually agreed upon Revitalization Plan;
- by enhancing human services through university sponsorship and commitment;

- by capitalizing on the synergies of academic and community goals;
- by providing lifelong learning opportunities; and
- by supporting a world class institution in a community of comparable quality.

Core Value #2: The University District shall be a place of pride by maintaining buildings, and conserving and enhancing architectural quality and character:

- by providing an abundance of open space, recreation, and parks;
- by providing accessibility to all uses and services for the entire neighborhood; and
- by ensuring adequate levels of public maintenance and service.

Core Value #3: The University District shall be culturally and socio-economically diverse:

- by providing diverse housing opportunities;
- by actively promoting home ownership;
- by providing housing opportunities for University faculty and staff; and
- by providing opportunities to live and work in the same neighborhood.

Core Value #4: The University District shall be a neighborhood of choice:

- by being friendly to traditional and non-traditional families;
- by including diverse student populations;
- by being safe and secure 24 hours per day; and
- by ensuring balanced transportation systems to support business and employment while promoting pedestrian/bicycle/transit options.

Core Value #5: The University District shall demonstrate new leadership and investment partnerships to reverse the decline in retail and housing:

- by coordinating positive investment partnerships between State, City, University, community, and individual investors;
- by expanding the economic base;
- by upgrading market standards; and
- by working positively with University-related residential and commercial cycles.

Core Value #6: The University District shall accomplish its larger civic goals through the active participation of community individuals and agencies:

- by maintaining open communication among all participants;
- by removing barriers and disincentives to participants; and
- by forging a new leadership collaborative of University, city, and community.

Translating the Vision and Values into Goals

An important foundation for the year long planning effort revolved around the definition of goals which move the vision and core values beyond its moral and philosophical underpinnings to an achievable plan. The key recommendations of the Revitalization Plan were developed to achieve four goals:

- Increase homeownership in the University District;
- Improve the core student area so that it is competitive with housing which students can rent in the suburbs; and
- Enhance and expand retail and commercial activity on High Street.
- Secure the involvement of The Ohio State University's faculty and staff in the neighborhoods of the University District.

Concept Plan Recommendations

The 16 major chapters of the Concept Document are organized around the six Core Values. Each Core Value and its corresponding major recommendations for the University District are described below;

Core Value #1: The University District shall be a model for University-community relationships.

Key Recommendations:

Faculty Participation

- Develop and implement increased opportunities for community-based teaching and inquiry in partnership with existing agencies, schools, businesses and community organizations, to prepare students in their discipline of study.
- Develop and implement a University District faculty seed grant program to encourage faculty and graduate student inquiry in the University District.

Core Value #2: The University District shall be a place of pride by maintaining buildings, and conserving and enhancing architectural quality and character.

Key Recommendations:

Code Enforcement

- Improve/strengthen the current code enforcement program through revisions to the code language and changes in enforcement.
- Institute a University District Pilot Code Enforcement Program.
- Institute a Case Management System.
- Develop and implement a Public Information Program.
- Provide incentives for property owners to address long standing code violations.

Parks and Greenways

- Develop new parks in the South Campus and Weinland Park (West) Neighborhoods.
- Expand Indianola Middle School grounds south to 18th Avenue.
- Expand Weinland Park to include the entire block between the Fourth and Summit Street pairs, on the south side of Seventh Avenue.
- Create a new park north of the existing fire station on the west side of Indianola Avenue between Eighth and Ninth Avenues.
- Develop greenways along 15th Avenue, 12th Avenue, Summit Street, Fourth Street, Indianola Avenue, Woodruff Avenue, Lane Avenue, Seventh Avenue, and 10th Avenue, including street tree programs, new lighting, signage, and bike route/bike lane designations.

Trash/Solid Waste Collection

- Provide twice weekly trash collection in the Neighborhoods, particularly during the school year, (September to June).
- Increase the frequency of bulk collection on a seasonal basis coinciding with changes in the University schedule.
- Establish a Solid Waste Service Fee Structure with revenues dedicated to funding solid waste/trash/and garbage collection services.
- Enact legislation that restricts deposition of litter on private and public property.
- Review present functional department structure for the regulation of health, environmental, waste, building codes, and inspections and assess the potential to combine departments for better efficiency and effectiveness.

Core Value #3: The University District shall be culturally and socio-economically diverse.

Key Recommendations:

Land Use and Zoning

- Examine downsizing certain neighborhoods to reflect the Overlay density standards.
- Mixed use areas that focus activity and new development should be located close to The Ohio State Campus.
- A strategy for identifying, prioritizing, and removing non-permitted properties should be established.
- The boundaries of the University Impact District should be expanded to include those areas that will be most susceptible to inappropriate development, given successful revitalization momentum and new investment in the District.

- A public relations program should be developed to communicate the objectives, intent, and benefits of the Overlay to homeowners, developers, and investors.
- Technical assistance should be made readily available at no cost or low cost for single family homeowners and purchasers that wish to renovate property or bring their property up to code, but are unsure how to work with or interpret the Overlay.
- To improve the economics of removing problem properties or upgrading of substandard properties in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods, aggregation of lots and transfer of development rights should be considered as incentives for new development in the proposed Mixed Use Areas.
- A task force of neighborhood representatives, city of Columbus Code Enforcement Officers, and the City's Attorney office need to identify and prioritize problem properties and work to remove or upgrade the worst offenders.
- Campus Partners, working with funding from the city of Columbus, The Ohio State University, and private banking institutions, should acquire the worst single family properties and facilitate their rehabilitation to single family homes if appropriate or complete removal.
- A limited number of sites from Fifth Avenue to Ninth Avenue that can accommodate new retailer should be identified.. Design criteria that meets community objectives to maintain the urban character of High Street coupled with development incentives should be offered for these sites.

Residential Revitalization

- Work with City and State officials to dedicate a portion of funds from existing homeownership programs to the University District, this will ensure that potential homebuyers have a guaranteed level of funding from existing programs.
- Ohio State should lead with a new program of specific incentives for faculty and staff homeownership in the Neighborhoods. The program could provide loan guarantees, interest subsidies, and downpayment assistance using models from other institutions around the country.
- Establish a marketing strategy and basic level of information and program support for any individual wishing to purchase a home, or rent long term in the University District.
- The city of Columbus and Ohio State should establish a Problem Property Fund to acquire and remove problem properties, targeting removal of 15 properties by the year 2000.
- For single family structures to be rehabilitated or de-converted from rooming houses, provide subsidies to ensure they can be sold at market rate to single family homeowners after renovation.
- Seek consistency with city of Columbus policies to avoid concentration of poverty.
- Work with HUD/CMHA to determine exact number of Section 8 units in given block areas, and develop strategies to transfer rental units into ownership while decreasing concentrations of property in accordance with City policy.
- Convene a planning committee to address potential displacement and identify possible solutions.
- Provide financial and organizational support to Columbus Housing Partnership/Northside Development Corporation for the development of 50 new units of affordable homeownership.
- Ohio State and city of Columbus, working through Campus Partners, should provide gap financing and assistance in managing the acquisition and renovation process of available properties.
- Following the financial commitments of The Ohio State University and the city of Columbus, Campus Partners should convene a Committee of Housing Providers, to decide how the proposed programs can best be implemented, and to determine what resources each stakeholder can bring to assist in the revitalization of the Neighborhoods.
- A district level plan should be prepared for the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods based on thorough inventory of existing conditions. The plan should guide problem property acquisition, location of off street parking, pocket recreation facility development, and prioritize new development sites for upgraded rental units.
- Develop 400 new rental units by the year 2000 that offer upgraded products. (compared with what is currently available in the East Campus)
- The Columbus Apartment Association with the assistance of Campus Partners and the city of Columbus, should create a Property Owners Association for portions of the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods to provide levels of security, litter removal, front yard maintenance, parking, and open space development commensurate with the density and character of the area.

Health and Well-Being

- Plan a Healthy Community Initiative in the University District.
- Plan and establish a Women Students and Children's Transitional Housing facility in the University District.
- Assure all new improvements provide appropriate accessibility for the disabled.

Employment and Economic Development

- Plan and establish a Comprehensive Employment Program for residents in the University District.
- Develop a Business Incubator in the University District.
- Develop mechanisms to advocate employment of University District residents by local employers.

Student Quality of Life

- Establish a Student Services Center in the East Campus Neighborhood to provide a community-based, integrated approach to the housing, and education, counseling, social service, and academic learning requirements of students living in the area.
- Expand and develop opportunities for all university students, faculty and staff to participate in community service.
- Increase University funding for student activities and develop and implement a diverse program of student activities offered at a variety of times and places throughout the campus and the University District.
- Develop a University training program for resident student managers for approved off-campus student housing.
- Implement the recommendations of the University's Alcohol and Other Drug Advisory Committee.

Core Value #4: The University District shall be a neighborhood of choice.

Key Recommendations:

Safety and Law Enforcement

- Work to assure successful implementation of community policing in the University District.
- Begin studying the possible expansion of The Ohio State University Police-CDP Mutual Aid Pact.
- Begin to develop positive relationships between the City, The Ohio State University, and community anchors. Conduct police sensitivity training for officers assigned to the area.
- Plan expansion of the Community Crime Patrol in the Neighborhoods.
- Work with Neighborhoods of Choice Coordinating Committee to develop a Super Agency to coordinate delivery of intervention services.
- Consider redefining cruiser districts to optimize police presence.

Community Schools

- Establish additional professional development schools including faculty and student placements in University area schools.
- Develop and provide additional seminars for teachers and other school professionals to improve skills in curriculum development and instructional strategies in urban schools.
- Develop a Partnership for Technology in Education to link the 12 public schools serving the University area, Columbus Public Schools at its North Education Center and The Ohio State University through its College of Education.
- Establish a Center for Community Learning in at least one University area school.
- Establish a Family Focus Center in at least one University area school.

Vehicular Circulation

- Improve automobile circulation for the University District by delineating a clear system of primary streets and neighborhood circulators for people moving either to, through, or within the University District.
- Provide two-way circulation on neighborhood streets, where possible, being particularly sensitive to parking needs.

- Minimize the volume of traffic passing through the Neighborhoods through the application of traffic-calming techniques and where necessary, defensible space treatments to reduce criminal activities.
- Provide proper access and circulation for Ohio State and its related facilities and for businesses along the corridor (including service vehicle access).
- Coordinate the access and circulation system with major pedestrian routes to provide safe pedestrian crossings.
- Link the access and circulation system with parking facilities.

Transportation Alternatives

Bus/Shuttle

- Enhance and improve the COTA bus service to encourage non-automobile travel to, from, and within the Ohio State area and its adjacent neighborhoods.
- Enhance and improve Ohio State's shuttle system to encourage non-automobile travel and to facilitate connections between Ohio State activity nodes and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Pedestrian/Bicycle

- Coordinate major on- and off-campus pedestrian routes and provide safe pedestrian crossings of roadways.
- Establish a system of bicycle routes through the area and connect The Ohio State University and neighborhood bicycle route system with the city-wide bicycle system.

Parking

- Define parking needs by neighborhood and block; provide on- and off-street parking space needs based on code.
- Provide off-street parking facilities in the off-campus student core to facilitate long-term (warehouse) parking; encourage students to warehouse their vehicles in the long term parking facilities.
- Control/eliminate commuter parking in the residential areas.
- Provide parking facilities for businesses in accordance with patron and employee needs; define operations and enforcement to control use by others.
- Devote on-street parking to short-term use in the zones serving the High Street commercial area.
- Expand the off-street parking supply through a combination of new parking structures and improved marketing of Ohio State parking garages.

Core Value #5: The University District shall demonstrate new leadership and investment partnerships to reverse the decline in retail and housing.

Key Recommendations:

Commercial Revitalization

- Support existing businesses and assist development of new locally owned businesses, while also attracting new national caliber retailers to create a vital mix of unique retail offerings and cost competitive retailers.
- Create a Special Improvement District for the High Street Corridor (East 9th Avenue to Lane Avenue) to provide daily maintenance, improved safety, District-wide marketing, and business support.
- Concentrate new and rehabilitated retail tenants into three distinct activity centers (11th and High, 15th and High, Lane and High) to serve as anchors for High Street revitalization while focusing available retail demand.
- Develop subsidized structured parking at locations within easy walking distance of the three activity centers to ensure the success of concentrated retail venues.
- Develop Design Guidelines for Retail and Commercial Uses within the University District and High Street in particular. Administration of the Guidelines should be by the existing University Area Review Board.
- Encourage conservation and adaptive reuse of existing buildings when feasible. Where new building construction is required, ensure that design is compatible with the existing scale, texture, and character of the corridor.

- Redevelop Pearl Alley as the primary service corridor for High Street businesses, with a minimum width of 24' and a maximum width of 36'.
- Upgrade the physical appearance of the High Street Corridor from 5th Avenue to Norwich Avenue with coordinated signage, lighting, street furnishings, and pavement systems.
- Create new public plazas and open space along High Street at current and proposed street closures to allow for passive and active retail and community uses.
- Strengthen the gateway role of Lane with significant architectural treatment of structures that frame the intersection of Lane and Tuttle Park Place on both the north and south side.
- The Ohio State University should assist in the Lane Avenue corridor redevelopment by offering creative parking solutions for new businesses, and building new structures that create a street wall on the south side of Lane from Tuttle Park Place to Neil Avenue.
- Create new commercial development in the 5th Avenue corridor (east of Hamlet Street) by combining lots with defensible street closures at Sixth Street, Hamlet Street, and Fifth Street.
- Facilitate the acquisition and exchange of public/private lands to create a new neighborhood center located between Fourth and Summit Streets on the north side of 11th Avenue. Ensure that the proposed city of Columbus Division of Electricity substation is not detrimental to the redevelopment of this key parcel.

Core Value #6: The University District shall accomplish its larger civic goals through the active participation of community individuals and agencies.

Key Recommendations:

Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities

- The President of The Ohio State University and the Mayor of Columbus need to execute a memorandum of agreement committing to roles and financial commitments for the first five years of the revitalization effort.
- The Campus Collaborative should continue to be the primary mechanism for linking the University District with the academic mission of the University.
- Campus Partners News needs to be continued and expanded as one of the Neighborhoods' main communication publications.
- The University District Organization should assume the role as the umbrella organization for all neighborhood groups active within the University District.
- The University District Organization should play an active role alongside Campus Partners in promoting homeownership programs, as well as the desirability of living in the Neighborhoods.
- The University Business Community Association should play an active role in the development of the Special Improvement District for High Street, as well as assist Campus Partners in the revitalization and redevelopment efforts for High Street.
- The University Area Commission should continue its leadership role in promoting revitalization and constructive change by actively supporting proposals that will achieve the plan goals.

Conclusion

Achieving the proposed vision of the University Neighborhoods as a city within a city that is safe, viable and diverse can only be accomplished by concurrently improving High Street, raising levels of home ownership, reducing both the reality and perception of crime, securing the active involvement of the University's staff, faculty, and students, and improving the competitive position of the student core area.

The Redevelopment Plan assembled by Campus Partners' planning team lays out specific recommendations to accomplish these tasks, by creating both physical and programmatic changes in the neighborhoods. Revising both the primary and secondary circulation system creates a new clarity and opportunity for residential areas to redevelop. Improved, expanded or new parks, all connected by a logical circuit of greenways and bike routes will improve both the visual quality of the area, the perception of open space and the ability to use transportation modes beyond the automobile. Finally, the recognition and formalization of neighborhood units that share similar concerns as well as zoning and policy considerations, provide a platform for grass-roots organizations to seize back their neighborhoods and take control of their long term destiny.

These physical improvements are balanced with specific programs such as community policing, comprehensive youth involvement programs and stronger cooperation between Ohio State and City of Columbus Police, all directed at improving the perception and reality of safety. Specific incentive programs for homeownership, modeled after successful programs throughout the country, will bring a dramatic level of private investment into the neighborhoods for little to no cost. Public service improvements, some of which are already underway, will require significant political leadership and community involvement to effect change. Finally, an innovative approach to leveraging the resources and talent of Ohio State and to an expanded definition of 'education' will provide the missing link between one-dimensional bricks and mortar improvements and the truly long term redevelopment success that so many other communities have sought.

In summary, the problems facing the University Neighborhoods are not insurmountable. However, the momentum of decline is accelerating toward a rapid downward spiral. Successfully turning this tide will require a multi-layered approach...one that utilizes a diverse group of resources, sponsors, and clear actions all focused toward holistic redevelopment of the University Neighborhoods as a unique, vital urban community.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Revitalization Plan Purpose And Structure

Purpose: The **University Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan** is a two-volume "family" of documents that includes the **University Neighborhoods Revitalization Concept Document** and a still to be developed **University Neighborhoods Implementation Strategy**. Before reading these two documents, it is important to understand what they are and are not and how they are structured.

The **University Neighborhoods Revitalization Concept Document (Concept)** is a decision-making tool for the city of Columbus, The Ohio State University, and various neighborhood groups and commissions to be used as they fulfill their respective responsibilities for managing or taking actions that affect the University District. The Concept document establishes the goals and core values for the revitalization process and presents a set of long-range objectives, policies, and recommendations that future actions should be directed to accomplish. It is intended to provide a vision of what the District can be, and how the community can realize that vision through clear actions. It is not, however, a detailed prescription meant to solve every problem that besets the District.

The Concept is intended to receive community support leading to its ultimate adoption by the Columbus City Council and The Ohio State University Board of Trustees as *the* major policy document relating to decisions for the University District. However, the proposed adoption of this document at its recommendations does not provide open license for Campus Partners or any other entity to move directly into implementation of the Plan. Many proposals will require ongoing refinement and action which will come only after extensive community input through traditional channels such as the University Area Commission, Development Commission, Traffic Commission and Columbus City Council. This is especially true relative to the issue of eminent domain. The sponsors of this effort, by virtue of the Plan's adoption do not hold powers of eminent domain. While these powers reside with, and may be granted by, the city of Columbus to an approved Redevelopment Corporation, they can only be activated through passage of an approved Redevelopment Plan that among other requirements validates the designation of blight, presents a business and financial plan for new or rehabilitated development, and provides relocation strategies for businesses or residents who are adversely affected by the redevelopment effort. The Redevelopment Plan will have to be created in conjunction with city agencies as well as local business and community leaders and must be approved by the City Council following an appropriate hearing process.

Whereas the Concept document establishes the core values, objectives, policies, and recommendations for the revitalization process, the **University Neighborhoods Implementation Strategy (Strategy)** will define the specific actions, timing, responsible parties, and estimated costs to implement these recommendations. The Strategy will be a living document that will require continual update and refinement as some programs meet success and others do not. It is intended that the Strategy would be endorsed by the city of Columbus and The Ohio State University as the best available approach at this time, but would not be adopted as a binding document due to the evolving nature of its contents.

Although the Revitalization Plan has greatly benefited from extensive community input, it is not intended to be a consensus document. Campus Partners, in their role as catalyst and facilitator, has forged a series of recommendations that will afford long-term, sustainable change within the community. While the actions required to effect this change will not be embraced by everyone, it is for the greater good of the overall community that the Revitalization Plan and its recommendations are put forth.

Structure: Following an introductory section, both documents are organized around the Revitalization Plan's six **Core Values**. Each Core Value is supported by individual chapters containing specific information developed by the planning team during the course of this study. In the Concept document, each chapter places the Objectives, Policies, and Recommendations at the beginning of the chapter so that the casual reader or individuals responsible for oversight of the Revitalization Plan can quickly identify the major thrust of the document. These are followed by supporting information for the policies and recommendations. Each chapter contains the following sections:

- **Objective:** Each chapter begins with an introductory paragraph that summarizes the major objectives to be achieved by the policies and recommendations that follow. The objective should be the desired end state.
- **Policies:** Policies are stated to guide the recommendations. By adopting the Concept document, community organizations, the city of Columbus and The Ohio State University will be adopting these policies for guiding future decisions in the University Neighborhoods.
- **Recommendations:** Recommendations are the planning team's best ideas to fulfill the policies.
- **Setting and Current Issues:** This section provides an overview of the current issues, the major findings of the planning team's analysis phase, and any relevant data necessary to support the recommendations.
- **Programs and Concepts:** This section provides more detail for the ideas and proposals, as well as potential models to support the recommendations.

The Strategy document will continue where the Concept left off. Every recommendation made in the Concept document will be repeated and followed by a series of actions intended to lead to achievement of that recommendation. Each action will be accompanied by a table of related information including:

- **Timing:** When the action should begin and will most likely end.
- **Responsible Party:** Who should assume primary responsibility for initiating, facilitating, or supporting the action.
- **Additional Input:** What other hearings or approvals will be required to enact this recommendation.

Related Documents: During the planning process, a number of supporting documents were reviewed or generated. While a full bibliography is included at the end of this document, the reader may wish to review certain documents that were produced during development of the Plan. Supporting documents include the **University Neighborhoods Vision Workshop Summary Report** (April 1995); **University Neighborhoods Alternatives Workshop Summary Report** (May 1995); **Results of Merchant Interviews in the University District** (June 1995); **Urban Land Institute Briefing Book** (July, 1995); **Urban Land Institute Advisory Panel Report** (November 1995); **Summary of Public Comment** (January 1996); **University Neighborhoods Social Demographic Profiles** (February 1996); and **University Neighborhoods, Technical Memorandum, Circulation and Parking**, (April 1996).

B. Revitalization Plan Development

Formation of Campus Partners and the Planning Team: In response to growing concerns regarding the quality of life in the University District, Ohio State President E. Gordon Gee and Columbus Mayor Greg Lashutka established the University Area Improvement Task Force in January 1994. This Task Force selected representatives from University faculty, staff and students, University community organizations, and the city of Columbus. Findings and recommendations were presented to Dr. Gee and Mayor Lashutka in June 1994. Among the group's many recommendations, the primary action presented was to create a non-profit redevelopment corporation to spearhead revitalization efforts and develop a comprehensive Revitalization Plan.

In September 1994, Dr. Gee and Mayor Lashutka announced their joint commitment to the revitalization effort, and in January 1995 Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment was incorporated as a non-profit 501(c)(3) and Ohio 1728 Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation. The Ohio State Board of Trustees approved an annual allocation of \$500,000 to Campus Partners for operating expenses, and assigned the organization two priorities for its first year of operation:

- To develop a comprehensive neighborhood Revitalization Plan accompanied by an Implementation Strategy.
- To actively promote projects and programs that can have an immediate, positive impact on the Neighborhoods.

To meet the first objective, The Ohio State University contributed \$600,000 and the city of Columbus contributed an additional \$187,000 for developing a Revitalization Plan. In February 1995 Campus Partners brought together experts in traditional areas of planning such as urban design and land use, housing, retail and commercial markets, circulation and parking, code enforcement, trash collection, and public safety. However,

unlike most urban revitalization efforts the team also included a consultant that focused on human services and quality of life issues. The Campus Collaborative consortium of colleges and academic units at Ohio State, and the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, worked with residents and human services professionals to assess education, health, economic development, and social services in the University District. This unique collaborative is comprised of faculty and graduate students from thirty-one different colleges and units of The Ohio State University and provides some of the most unique aspects of the Revitalization Plan.

The list of those participating in the collaborative includes: Architecture, Board of Trustees Committee on Student Affairs, Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, Campus Planning, City and Regional Planning, Council of Graduate Students, Off-Campus Student Services, Education, Federal Relations, Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Health Sciences (including Allied Medical Professions, Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, Optometry, University Hospitals, Veterinary Medicine), Human Ecology, Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, Law, Mershon Center, Ohio State Extension, Public Policy and Management, Rardin Family Practice Center, Social Work, Undergraduate Student Government, University Architects Office, University College, and University Libraries.

Planning Process: The Campus Partners consulting team followed an accelerated planning process that covered all areas of their individual disciplines in less than eight months. A traditional inventory and analysis phase made use of an extensive Geographic Information System (GIS) constructed for the project from primary and secondary data sources. Interviews were held with numerous residents, businesses, and merchants. All of the analytical work was presented and reviewed during a series of public meetings and task force sessions. A seven-day workshop was held at Campus Partners' office after the project's first three months of analysis to test preliminary concepts. As these alternatives were refined, preliminary recommendations were developed and documented for a "reality check" by both the community and a special panel of experts assembled by the Urban Land Institute (ULI). Following the ULI's review, the Revitalization Plan was refined further. A working draft of the Revitalization Plan was issued to the public in November 1995, eight months after the study had started. With the addition of valuable public input, the Revitalization Plan was refined with the final plan issued in June 1996.

Urban Land Institute Panel Review: In July 1995, five months after the planning process had begun, the ULI was invited to help evaluate the planning team's work to date. The intensive one-week review was put together by ULI's Advisory Services Panel, and draws on the volunteer services of ULI members experienced in all aspects of inner-city revitalization and redevelopment issues. The Panel is an extension of ULI's Inner-City Community Building Program that was launched in 1993 to involve the private sector more extensively in inner-city issues.

The Panel's final series of recommendations both confirmed the progress to date and added valuable new direction to certain aspects of the study. The Revitalization Plan's review by experienced private sector development and public sector officials was aided by extensive community interviews. While the Panel provided a strong endorsement for the team's work to date, many of the Panel's additional suggestions were incorporated into the final Revitalization Plan.

Community Involvement: From the start of the planning process, Campus Partners and their consulting team have involved neighborhood organizations and residents; major property owners; business owners; and University faculty, staff, and students. As a part of the Campus Partners staffing plan, a full-time Director of Community Relations and part-time community outreach assistant were appointed to formulate a community involvement program and ensure constructive outreach efforts. These efforts included:

Public Participation: Public participation in the program was extensive with over 500 individuals participating during the development of the study through:

- A Community Advisory Council composed of over 90 representatives from neighborhood and community organizations as well as local government and University offices. This group met five times to review concepts and plans at various points in the development of the Revitalization Plan.
- Six public task forces which worked with the consultant team in specific areas of concern. These included: market and finance; safety and law enforcement; planning, design, and architecture; transportation, circulation, and parking; public services; and social services which include education,

- health services, human services, and economic development. Additionally, a special sub-group was established to address student quality of life issues. These task forces were composed of representatives from organizations participating in the Advisory Council as well as individual citizens.
- Community-wide meetings held to present updates on the work progress and to test ideas. This effort consisted of five evening meetings held in various locations throughout the District, in addition to a five-hour open house held one Saturday, early in the process, to review preliminary concepts. Attendance at the evening meetings ranged from 50 to 300, and the open house was attended by over 350 individuals.
 - Neighborhood meetings with small, focus group representatives of specific areas within the District. These meetings, typically held in living rooms and community centers, were conducted with seven different groups on two separate occasions.
 - The ULI Advisory Services Panel, which conducted interviews with over 115 people from the neighborhood, City, and University and whose publicly presented final report drew over 125 representatives from the community.

Community Outreach: Efforts included development of a special Campus Partners Newsletter mailed to every household in the University District and distributed to Ohio State faculty, staff, and students through insertion in *The Lantern*, The Ohio State University student newspaper. Each issue had a circulation of over 50,000 copies. In addition to the newsletter, residents and property owners were contacted before all public meetings with a personal mailer. Prior to any public meetings or workshops, extensive television, radio, and newspaper outreach was undertaken.

Document Review: All documents prepared by the planning team were made available for review by the community, either through their placement at three library locations (Whetstone, Northside, and OSU Main) and at the Campus Partners office. Additionally, most documents were made available for purchase through Kinkos, Grade A Notes, and Cop-EZ, for the cost of reproduction. Finally, direct delivery of specific documents were made to members of the Campus Partners Board of Trustees, the leaders of community organizations, and individuals from the community who have been active in the process.

C. Revitalization Plan Goals, Vision, And Core Values

Revitalization Goals: *First and foremost, the overall goal of this revitalization effort is to improve the quality of life for individuals who live and work in the University District.*

Four supporting goals have been identified for the revitalization effort by the Urban Land Institute and the planning team. These are:

- Increase homeownership in the University District, including affordable housing opportunities to stabilize the Weinland Park neighborhood and maintain a diversity of residents;
- Improve the core student area so that it is competitive with housing which students can rent in the suburbs; and
- Enhance and expand retail and commercial activity on High Street.
- Secure the involvement of Ohio State's faculty and staff in the neighborhoods of the University District;

Achieving these goals will require overcoming 30 years of inertia that has stalled past revitalization efforts. Working with a group of 25 leaders selected from the community, a Vision Statement and set of Core Values were developed during a two-day workshop held in March 1995 to guide the revitalization effort.

Vision Statement: *"The University District shall become a high-quality 'city within a city,' characterized by diverse, enriched, safe, livable, and commercially viable neighborhoods with community features and programs connected by a district-wide framework of transportation, open space, amenities, and human services."*

The Vision Statement captures a positive image of what the University District's future can be. At the heart of this vision is recognition of the District as a collection of individual neighborhoods, each with a great diversity of lifestyles, housing choices, income levels, and priorities.

Core Values: The overall vision for the University District embodies six Core Values that serve as the organizing element for all recommendations and actions. Core Values are firmly held beliefs that establish the continuity between all future actions. The refinement of these Core Values has occurred over the nine-month planning process, shaped by public input and responses to the Revitalization Plan.

Core Value #1: The University District shall be a model for university-community relationships:

- by optimizing University investment in the community according to a mutually agreed upon Revitalization Plan;
- by enhancing human services through University sponsorship and commitment;
- by capitalizing on the synergy of academic and community goals;
- by providing lifelong learning opportunities; and
- by supporting a world class institution in a community of comparable quality.

Core Value #2: The University District shall be a place of pride by maintaining buildings, and conserving and enhancing architectural quality and character:

- by providing an abundance of open space, recreation, and parks;
- by providing accessibility to all uses and services for the entire neighborhood; and
- by ensuring adequate levels of public maintenance and service.

Core Value #3: The University District shall be culturally and socio-economically diverse:

- by providing diverse housing opportunities;
- by actively promoting home ownership;
- by providing housing opportunities for University faculty and staff; and
- by providing opportunities to live and work in the same neighborhood.

Core Value #4: The University District shall be a neighborhood of choice:

- by being friendly to traditional and non-traditional families;
- by including diverse student populations;
- by being safe and secure 24 hours per day; and
- by ensuring balanced transportation systems to support business and employment while promoting pedestrian/bicycle/transit options.

Core Value #5: The University District shall demonstrate new leadership and investment partnerships to reverse the decline in retail and housing:

- by coordinating positive investment partnerships between State, City, University, community, and individual investors;
- by expanding the economic base;
- by upgrading market standards; and
- by working positively with University-related residential and commercial cycles.

Core Value #6: The University District shall accomplish its larger civic goals through the active participation of community individuals and agencies:

- by maintaining open communication among all participants;
- by removing barriers and disincentives to participants; and
- by forging a new leadership collaborative of University, City, and community.

II. REVITALIZATION PLAN CONCEPTS

A. Plan Context

Planning Area Location and Boundaries: The study area, identified as "University Neighborhoods" is a subset of the University District, a 2.5 square mile planning area approximately 2 miles directly north of downtown Columbus. The District's 1,500 acres are bounded by Glen Echo Ravine to the north, the Conrail corridor to the east, 5th Avenue to the south, and the Olentangy River to the west. The study area follows approximately these same boundaries but does not include any of the District north of Northwood Avenue, or the area south of King Avenue and west of the alley directly behind High Street. While recommendations are presented primarily to revitalize the University neighborhoods, it should not be assumed similar problems do not exist in other parts of the District.

Current Setting: The Ohio State University is the most visible element of the District, occupying approximately 400 of the District's 1,500 acres. Consequently, while The Ohio State University in many ways defines the University District, the area is not a uniform campus neighborhood. Rather, the University District is an extremely diverse collection of distinctive neighborhoods with a broad range of residents, incomes, and ethnic backgrounds. With only 1.5% of the City's land area, the University District has 7% of the city's population.

According to the 1990 Census, the University District had 48,142 residents, including about 22,000 Ohio State students living on and off campus. (Of the University's 16,000 faculty and staff on the Columbus campus, however, less than 4 percent live in the University District.) About 40,000 residents were white and 5,100 were black. Adding to the District's diversity were 2,600 Asians. The District also has the largest rental housing market in the City, and supports over 700 businesses, human service agencies, churches, and schools, including Ohio State, its major medical center and Battelle Memorial Institute. Each day more than 100,000 people enter the University District to attend the University, work, or shop. In addition, over 3.5 million people visit the University and University Hospitals each year. Although the University District remains a vital center of activity for Columbus, it is failing to attract homeowners or maintain an effective mix of retail and commercial businesses.

Problem Statement: While the industrialized Midwest as a region, and metropolitan areas in particular have been struggling to maintain their population base and rates of employment over the past 15 years, the city of Columbus has prospered. Between 1980 and 1990, Columbus's population grew by 10.7%. Correspondingly, employment grew by 26%, well ahead of the State's 5% employment growth rate. Coupled with this impressive rate of growth, a new image of Columbus is fueled by its transition from a producer of goods to a contemporary service provider. Columbus is increasingly viewed as the Midwest's most progressive and energetic city.

Contributing to this growth and improved image is The Ohio State University (Ohio State or OSU), a significant economic engine for central Ohio. In the 125 years since its founding, Ohio State has grown in academic stature and size to become the premier graduate and research institution in the State, as well as a recognized institution of higher learning at a national level. Yet at a point when both the city of Columbus and Ohio State have improved their respective images, their success is being severely threatened by the increasing deterioration of the neighborhoods surrounding OSU.

Although the University District remains a vital center of activity for Columbus, it is failing to retain and attract homeowners and is losing its once-captive market position for students. Despite its abundance of affordable single and two-family housing stock and excellent location relative to the University and downtown Columbus, the District has experienced a tremendous drop in home ownership levels, from 50% in 1950 to just over 11% in 1990. At the same time, many prospective students and their parents, especially high-ability students, are deciding not to attend Ohio State due to a setting that is perceived as disintegrating and unsafe. As the University District has lost students and homeowners, it has received a disproportionate share of federally subsidized Section 8 housing (1,175 Section 8 units), with the highest concentration located in the Weinland Park area.

Public safety and crime are also central concerns within the University District. In 1994, on a per capita basis, violent crime in the University District was 14.2 % higher than Columbus as a whole and property crime was 21.6% higher. The Weinland Park neighborhood, suffering from gang activity and illegal drug sales, has the highest per capita rate of violent crime in the City. Problems in the University District attracted statewide attention in 1994 with the murder of Ohio State freshman student Stephanie Hummer.

Other visible problems abound. A 20-year legacy of ineffective code enforcement coupled with the economic pressures of overzoning have led to inappropriate and poorly constructed renovations of dormitory style apartment complexes. Extremely high densities coupled with insufficient public services have resulted in overflowing trash containers, unswept streets, and inadequate or overutilized park and recreational facilities.

Elements of Decline: A review of past and current conditions in the University District has led to the identification of ten key elements contributing to the decline in the University District's quality of life:

- **A 40-year evolution of the District into a high density, student-residential core** without adequate modification or expansion of supporting infrastructure, public services, parks, or open space.
- **Deteriorating infrastructure and functionally obsolete building stock along High Street** which restrict its economic vitality. Disorganized and insufficient parking; constrained service access; inefficient and poorly maintained retail spaces; and non-existent street maintenance all preclude a vibrant, diverse business corridor.
- **Over-concentration of liquor licenses within the south High Street bar district** at the High Street – 11th Avenue intersection. The negative image of the area is worsened by the highly visible police patrols required on weekends to manage crowds frequenting the bars.
- **The continued rise of crime and illegal drug sales** that began in the early 1980s and has escalated to some of the highest levels in the Columbus area.
- **The perceptual barriers of Ohio State University** that the physical campus and hence the institution's responsibility stops at High Street.
- **An extremely low level of home ownership** and the highly transient nature of the student resident population which has hindered the sense of pride, commitment, and responsibility witnessed in healthy urban neighborhoods.
- **Poorly rehabilitated and ill-conceived adaptive reuse** of original single-family housing and neighborhood commercial structures, coupled with development practices that were designed for short-term return only. This has resulted in high levels of disinvestment due to the impact of the 1986 federal tax law.
- **A reduction of student housing demand** by an estimated 2,000 students, coupled with same price/higher quality and better managed housing choices available in the suburbs.
- **The intense concentration of subsidized housing in the area**, especially in the southeast corner of the District, and a fragmented approach to human service assistance, delivery, and support.
- **A limited but highly visible number of problem landlords** whose problem properties and lack of concern for good management have significant impact on surrounding property values and livability.

Opportunities and Assets: Although the University District faces severe challenges, it has significant assets from which successful revitalization effort can be built. ***First and foremost, the problems confronting the University District are not overwhelming, and the basic housing stock and infrastructure are far above the level of most troubled urban areas.*** Other current assets include:

- **Excellent location and regional access** – The University District's central location, which presents particular residential and commercial market opportunities, is enhanced by its easy regional vehicular access. Four-lane SR 315 and Interstate 71 are located just west and east of the District, respectively. High Street, Fourth Street, and Summit Street arterials provide additional accessibility within the street system of Columbus.
- **Clearly defined boundaries**, with the University and the Olentangy River to the west, the Conrail tracks to the east, Glen Echo Ravine to the north, and 5th Avenue to the south. The area is well-defined and programs can be targeted to meet specific issues within a confined area.
- **Surrounding successful neighborhoods** that provide stability and market value. These include Clintonville to the north and the energy of the revitalized Short North, Italian, and Victorian villages to the south and southwest.

- **Diversity of both residents and housing opportunities.** The broad range of housing structures, historic character, and neighborhood setting provide a variety of opportunities for individuals of different interests and incomes to enjoy a convenient, urban lifestyle in a neighborhood that offers proximity to a major educational and cultural amenity such as The Ohio State University.
- **A very strong market** for new housing, retail, and office units generated by Ohio State's 48,500 students, 16,000 faculty, staff, and thousands of visitors, as well as neighborhood residents or the potential of the remainder of the Columbus metropolitan area.
- **High Street**, which is currently a mixed blessing for the neighborhood, nonetheless offers a strong foundation for retail that will act as a service to the university population, an amenity for neighborhood residents, and potentially an attraction to other Columbus area residents. High Street can also be a desirable location for office, rental apartments, and, in the long run, hotels.
- **An involved and concerned community** of residents who have fought to protect and conserve the character and diversity of the area for 30-plus years. The enormous energy, knowledge and commitment of this constituency is a major resource that if properly supported and channeled will help effect the critical changes necessary.
- **A host of revitalization programs** already in place substantially reduces the administrative and policy modifications that might be required as part of any new neighborhood redevelopment initiative. Programs such as the City of Columbus Neighborhoods of Choice and the Columbus Neighborhood Design Assistance Center can play a major role in shaping the University District's future.
- **Existing human and social service programs**, both City-sponsored and neighborhood-based, can be enhanced and built upon to improve the long-term conditions and opportunities for University District residents. The District already features a broad cross section of schools, religious groups, and social service centers with considerable experience assisting the District's population. (Refer to Appendix A for full listing of programs)

B. Planning Principles

Community Concept - Building Community From the Inside Out: The University District is a complex community whose defining social characteristic is diversity. This asset has been consistently championed by the residents and leaders of this planning effort, and is clearly endorsed as an essential component of the community's vision. To sustain this diversity, the Plan advocates building the community from the inside out and maximize the contributions of community partners such as its residents, Ohio State, and the city of Columbus. These same community stakeholders have formed an active and important partnership throughout the process. Their input has shaped and refined every element of the Revitalization Plan, and will continue to guide the implementation process as the District becomes a model for university-community relationships.

The purpose of building community from the inside out is to attain a sustainable state of involvement, partnership, and hence, revitalization. This is achieved using an assets-based approach. Even neighborhoods that are experiencing high levels of distress have many assets and strengths including the residents themselves, and the professionals in schools, agencies, and houses of worship. Through a persistent process of identifying assets and building community using "home-grown" assets, the District can enhance the quality of the life of its residents, revitalize its housing and economy, create new employment opportunities, and increase the sense of hope.

Planning Concept – A Neighborhood Whose Time Has Come Again: The University Neighborhoods original plan of gridded streets, mixture of housing types and stock, distribution of local commercial structures in each neighborhood, and a community main street that provides day-to-day goods and services is a living example of the traditional town planning principles that formed the basis of American community development in the early 1900s. Following WWII, many of these concepts were lost as more and more Americans left urban settings for the perceived convenience and status of life in the suburbs. Recently, however, increasing traffic congestion, a recognized lack of community and diversity, and the monotony of many new suburban communities has focused new national attention and market interest on a revival of these traditional planning principles.

Revitalization of the University Neighborhoods is a perfect opportunity to demonstrate the desirability of urban living by capitalizing on a community structure whose time has come again. The University

Neighborhoods should provide a viable alternative for individuals who eschew the suburbs and instead seek to live:

- amongst a richly textured setting of history and diverse neighbors;
- close to employment opportunities and a variety of retail and neighborhood services;
- within easy driving or walking distance to the emerging urban center that is downtown Columbus; and
- next to a major cultural and educational amenity such as The Ohio State University.

Land Use Concept – A Self-Contained Community: The land use concept for the University Neighborhoods is to develop as a self-contained community, providing employment, education, recreation, retail, and residential opportunities within its well-defined boundaries. A highly developed community of this caliber can rely on its rich mix of uses and variety of densities and housing types to create a vibrant and diverse set of living and activity opportunities for residents and visitors.

In applying this concept to the University Neighborhoods, Ohio State should be viewed positively and constructively as the economic engine and a major amenity for the community; High Street should be seen as the community's focal point - a symbol of local identity and the community's center of shopping, entertainment, and campus/community interaction. The surrounding neighborhoods should be seen as the bedroom and living component of the community. Interspersed within these broad land use categories are schools, parks, churches, and neighborhood retail centers. Connecting these elements is a fabric of streets, pedestrian ways, bike lanes, and greenways.

Commercial Concept – High Street as Main Street: As the heart and soul of the University Neighborhoods, High Street will act as both 'main street' and the focus of the entire community. The traditional main streets of small cities and towns were a location for both commerce and social interaction. With High Street's ideal position at the center of the District, it is the one place where all residents and visitors will meet, mingle, and interact. High Street can also be the most common image that integrates all land uses. While linear in nature (traversing the community from north to south) it should not be a monotonous corridor of similar uses, building scale, and identity. Instead, as one progresses north along High Street, they should pass through a series of "rooms" each with a theme that unites building form, uses, and tenants. However, each room should be urban in nature and respect the basic principles of an active, vital street scene: identifiable and inviting building entries; transparent and exciting storefronts; an urban street wall that is either constructed or inferred; a common design of street furnishings; unique signage; well-maintained landscape; and wide sidewalks that line both sides of the street.

The three most distinctive "rooms" will be the centers, proposed for 11th Avenue and High Street, 15th Avenue and High Street, and Lane Avenue and High Street. Each of these centers will be connected by smaller infill uses (either new or rehabilitated structures) that provide a diverse mix of tenants; uses (retail, office and residential); and building heights, materials, and character.

Residential Concept – Neighborhoods of Choice: On either side of the High Street corridor is a rich texture of distinct neighborhoods, each defined by its residents, housing stock, and unique focal points. Even Ohio State, which is typically seen as an intruder to the Neighborhoods, is really a neighborhood of its own, providing the majority of the community's employment and a large proportion of its daytime population. Viewing the community as a series of distinct neighborhoods instead of a singular land use of housing establishes the basic premise for how planning concepts should be tailored for each area. Some of these ideals include:

- **Seamless Edges** – A major component of revitalization should be the University-community interface. Streets such as Lane Avenue and West 10th Avenue are traditionally viewed as the points where the campus ends and the community begins. While it is important to define the boundaries of the University from a jurisdictional and operational standpoint, it is the land uses that line the edges of the north and south campus that can facilitate a more harmonious relationship with the surrounding community. These residential areas should not stop at the centerline of the adjoining street, but should instead bridge these rights-of-way. While property ownership on each side of the street will vary, the land use, intent, and character should not. Consequently, one could argue that the South Residential Campus really begins at 12th and ends at 8th Avenue, and the area surrounding Lane should really begin at Woodruff Avenue and end at Northwood Avenue.

- **Recognizing the Larger Campus Community** – Looking to the east, the planning concept proposes that the area between Pearl Street and Summit Street be considered Ohio State's *East Campus*. Similar to the concept of student areas spanning Lane Avenue and West 10th Avenue, the East Campus concept incorporates the center of the area currently known as the 'Student Core' which actually provides more student housing than the on-campus residences. The combination of an newly defined 'East Campus' with the concept of an expanded North and South Campus provides a larger view of the relationship between the University and the community. While the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods are primarily private sector owned, the University has a responsibility to provide amenities and resources that will improve the quality of life for its students within these neighborhood.

Urban Design Concept - Connecting It All Together: The distinct enclaves that provide focus and identity are connected by a larger fabric of streets and open space connections. The framework plan recommends that while it is important to create identifiable neighborhoods and precincts that can take control of their destiny at a grass roots level, it is also important to have a connective fabric that unites the entire community of neighborhoods and leads them to the main street - High Street. Therefore the existing grid of streets should remain with minor modifications as required to improve circulation, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, or to implement defensible space concepts. Secondly, the street wall needs to be maintained and enhanced on all major corridors using simple techniques such as minimum building setbacks, inferred edges of landscape, low fencing, or grading techniques.

C. Revitalization Plan Framework

Given the scale and complexity of the University Neighborhoods, the Community Framework establishes improvements to be built up in a series of eight successive layers; District Circulation, Neighborhood Circulation; Transit Options, Bikeway Routes, Planning Areas, Land Use; Greenways and Open Space; and Quality of Life Improvements. The result of these layers creates a physical structure to be implemented over time, acting as a "skeleton" for other revitalization efforts. When neighborhood projects, initiated by the public and private sectors, are inserted into this framework, the sum will be truly greater than the individual parts.

Circulation

A revised circulation system for the University Neighborhoods provides a clear hierarchy of primary streets to connect to the regional transportation network, while providing neighborhood circulators for people moving either through or within their respective neighborhoods. The circulation framework also emphasizes alternative transportation modes to achieve a long-term reduction in automobile use.

District Circulation: District Circulators provide efficient access to major destinations within the University District, including The Ohio State University campus and major commercial destinations such as High Street. They also route traffic through the University District with minimal disruption of the neighborhood's quality of life. The streets that compose the District Circulation system include Summit Street (one-way southbound), Fourth Street (one-way northbound), 5th Avenue (two-way east/west), Hudson Avenue (two-way east/west), and Dodridge Avenue (one-way east). Gateway streets will be the major entry corridors into the neighborhood, and include Lane Avenue from SR 315 to High Street (two-way east to west) and 11th Avenue from I-71 to High Street (two-way east/west). High Street will continue to serve as a major north-south link but will take on a more defined role as the community's primary transit corridor.

Neighborhood Circulation: The second system for vehicular circulation provides internal movement within each neighborhood. These "neighborhood collector streets" form the primary circulation route within each neighborhood, while also providing a connections to the District Circulation network. Important Neighborhood Circulators include Woodruff Avenue, 15th Avenue and 12th Avenue, 10th Avenue, 7th/King Avenue all in the east/west direction, and Neil Avenue and Indianola Avenue, in the north/south direction.

Transit Options: Concepts include enhancing and expanding The Ohio State University's transit and shuttle service to key areas of the University District and better service from COTA to improve broader use of mass transit and reduce the need for automobiles in the District. Long term route expansions for the North and South Campus Neighborhoods are proposed to be implemented only when new resources become available.

Bicycle Routes: In addition to the vehicular system and transit improvements are recommendations to enhance bicycle accessibility within the Neighborhoods, and primarily to and from the Ohio State campus. An important component of these improvements is the use of the Neighborhood Circulator as the community's bikeway system

Neighborhood Structure Land Use: The overall land use concept strives to locate residential and commercial uses so that the highest level of activity and diversity will occur around The Ohio State University campus. From this center, levels of activity and mixed use should taper off as one moves east, south and north into areas that are predominantly single family residential. This is to be accomplished by intensifying rental residential and commercial development along High Street (between East 9th Avenue and 16th Avenue), Lane Avenue (between the Olentangy River and High Street), along 11th Avenue (between Summit Street and High Street) and on the north side of West 10th Avenue (between Neil Avenue and High Street). New market responsive housing should be developed where problem properties have been removed closest to key commercial and activity centers (such as the campus) to reduce dependence on automobiles

Next to the mixed use areas and surrounding the campus, it is envisioned that a moderate intensity transitional zone of single family and multi-family uses would provide housing opportunities for a broad variety of income levels and residents.

Furthest from the proposed centers of activity would reside predominantly single family residential neighborhoods, with small duplex and rowhouse properties mixed in. This use would result over time through recommended actions that include removal of problem properties that have had a negative impact on certain blocks, as well as through changes to existing zoning classifications in some neighborhoods to more restrictive, but consistent classifications, with the existing principles of the 1992 Overlay.

For more detailed explanation of these concepts, refer to Chapter 5.0: Land Use and Zoning.

Planning Areas: The primary circulation system, along with other natural and cultural boundaries defines the edges of eleven distinct Planning Areas. While many neighborhoods within the University District have commonly used names or active community groups, the purpose of defining a set of Planning Areas is to facilitate the development of framework solutions and a connected system of grass roots organizations that represent all areas of the District. Through the identification of Planning Areas of relatively equal size and bound by similar concerns, recommendations and actions can be implemented to achieve revitalization specific to that Area's unique issues.

While the accompanying diagram uses a series of names to define each Area, these are meant to be working titles only. Areas identified as the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods are named as such simply because they are areas whose residents are primarily students. These terms are not meant to imply university ownership. These and other area titles may be modified over time as part of a consolidated community effort to increase identity and marketability of the University District's unique neighborhoods.

Each of the eight Planning Areas addressed in this Revitalization Plan suggest a distinct center or focus (e.g., neighborhood park, community center, school, neighborhood retail, etc.). These are either existing features or new features proposed to fulfill an identified lack of facilities.

Greenways and Open Space: The Greenways and Open Space layer is designed to connect existing, expanded, or new parks and open space features with enhanced streetscapes. This historic approach to linking parks with "greenways"—streets that include a coordinated street tree program, improved sidewalks, and bike lane or bike route improvements—will greatly increase the perception of open space within the District. The connections will also provide a viable alternative to automobile-based transportation and increase both the area's property values and attractiveness to new homeowners. When fully implemented, these improvements alone will add more than 12 acres of new park to the University District.

Park expansions include Indianola Middle School and Weinland Park School. New parks are proposed for sites on East 12th Avenue between Fourth and Summit Streets; 8th Avenue and Indianola Avenue; West 10th between Hunter Avenue and Highland Avenue, and at the Godman Guild. Rehabilitation and improvements are suggested for Iuka Ravine Medary School and Tuttle Park. Greater encouragement and accessibility to open space at The Ohio State University would greatly improve the quality of recreation opportunities for residents.

Quality of Life Improvements: Improving the quality of life in the University District will come not only from the physical framework described in the first three layers, but also from creating a social infrastructure that supports and sustains human interaction. This includes the informal and formal associations of individuals, but also their relationship with the institutions and agencies in the area. These proposals are designed to build upon the community's existing base of strength. Rather than creating a new array of programs and organizations, the Plan's major recommendations rely on stronger partnerships and improved community relationships with committed participation from individuals. Residents confirmed their belief in this approach through the identification of the nearly limitless human resources of the University District.

To form the foundation of this layer, a process of mapping these assets has begun and will need to be continued throughout the implementation process with increasing levels of specificity. A general map of the community's gifts and assets has at its center the gifts of its individuals. Surrounding the individuals and giving them strength are associations of individuals. The associations provide a synergistic effect, improving the quality of life in the community by enhancing the gifts of the individuals. Finally, local institutions and agencies provide additional strength and cohesion by organizing all of the community's gifts and offering them as services that further enhance the quality of life in the community.

The Plan also proposes a collaborative, continuously evolving model for enhancing the quality of life of individuals in the University District by establishing a model University-community relationship. The model includes five stages, each of which is characterized by collaboration. This model can be applied to the entire Plan from development through implementation. The model can also be applied, as illustrated below, to the specific area of human services, or to any other individual recommendation in the Plan. Its central feature is collaboration at every stage, diversity of participation, and continuous improvement through ongoing adaptation and assessment.

III. POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Core Value #1: The University District shall be a model for university-community relationships.

The neighborhoods around Ohio State are linked to the university and its central educational mission. Just as the university is a model educational institution, the Plan provides the opportunity for the Neighborhoods to become a model teaching community in which the central characteristic of its common environment is education in the broadest sense. The partnership between The Ohio State University as a world-class university, the neighborhoods surrounding it, and the city of Columbus provides an unparalleled opportunity to achieve this goal. Residents, the City, and the university have come together to transform the University District. This investment and partnership can be secured and strengthened by establishing the University District as a model teaching community committed to educational excellence in every dimension of its life, and as a national benchmark for urban university area revitalization.

Faculty Participation

Education is both broadly understood in the University District and intrinsically linked to the human, intellectual, and physical resources of The Ohio State University through its academic departments and administrative offices. Education is a life-long activity, and the University District encompasses the full range of the life cycle in its educational mission.

Community life in the District's "Teaching" Neighborhoods is being built around education as a way to understand relationships between residents, organizations, and institutions. Education for community living, understanding diversity, and civic responsibility are key elements in creating a sense of self-determination and community. Responsibility for neighborhoods, families, and neighbors becomes a critical area for teaching and learning in community life. Creating community while honoring the diversity of the Neighborhoods will establish a paradigm from which other urban areas throughout the country will benefit and learn.

Education also provides the key to the continuing and pressing problems of public safety and crime, housing code enforcement, and neighborhood clean-up. In each area, modifications in public policies and services will only partially address the problems. Resident, agency, and provider education are essential dimensions of effective solutions.

Through a comprehensive, broad-based approach to teaching and learning, the University District and the university are establishing an environment and resource base for creating an exemplary community. The community will demonstrate new techniques for building on the strengths of citizens and institutions, and structure relationships to enhance the many assets that exist in this teaching community. This unique and comprehensive approach to the University District revitalization has placed The Ohio State University in a leadership role for addressing complex urban issues in university communities. With education as the cornerstone of the approach, the intellectual and human resources of the university will strengthen the community, providing a foundation for new and lasting partnerships.

Neighborhoods and Educational Excellence

The University District is a city within a city made up of a number of distinct neighborhoods. Each of these neighborhoods has a unique character, strengths, and deficits, and each neighborhood serves as a focal point for achieving educational excellence. Each neighborhood provides opportunities for maximum interaction, communication, and learning among residents. A full range of opportunities will assist in creating a teaching and learning community in each neighborhood.

Residents report that schools, community centers, senior centers, and worship centers are natural gathering places for community activities. These gathering points facilitate interaction, communication, and education.

Social service agencies and health care delivery sites help individuals build upon their strengths as well as address their limitations.

Teaching and learning opportunities can be community or neighborhood based as well as institution based. Many institutions recognize that the more closely tied to the community their services and educational activities become, the more effective they are. Focusing education and services in neighborhoods wherever possible strengthens each neighborhood, its residents and families, and assists in building excellence as well as a sense of community.

There is no doubt that existing public schools, social service agencies, health care facilities, child care providers, and religious organizations are considered by the majority of residents as among the key neighborhood resources. Residents repeatedly identified these institutions and their staffs as among the most significant assets in the community. There are approximately 198 such agencies and institutions spread throughout the University District Neighborhoods. These institutions and agencies are the heart of the human service system for university area residents and others who find their way into the community.

1.0 FACULTY PARTICIPATION

A. Objectives

As a major resource, the university can offer its human capital to the University District. Community-based teaching and inquiry, therefore, will contribute directly to strengthening the community as well as the curriculum of the university. The principal objective for faculty participation in the University Neighborhoods is as follows:

Objective: Increase and strengthen faculty participation in the University District consistent with the teaching, inquiry, and service missions of the university.

These Neighborhoods also provide an important urban opportunity for teaching and learning. Working with community residents, agencies, and organizations, university faculty and their students will build new partnerships that enhance teaching. Community-based teaching can provide a context in which to apply learning while helping revitalize the Neighborhoods.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 1.1: A wide variety of community-based teaching, inquiry and service opportunities should be developed and dispersed throughout the University District.

Recommendation 1.1.1: Develop and implement increased opportunities for community-based teaching and inquiry in partnership with existing agencies, schools, businesses and industries, community organizations, and other partners and assemblies of citizens to better prepare students in their discipline of study.

Policy 1.2: The university should provide incentives for faculty to develop community-based teaching and inquiry in the University Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 1.2.1: Develop and implement a University Neighborhoods Faculty Seed Grant Program to encourage faculty and graduate student inquiry in the University District.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Faculty teaching and inquiry play a critical role in creating the environment for educational excellence in the University District. Community-based teaching strengthens faculty participation in the community. It enables faculty to offer students opportunities to learn directly about community involvement in the improvement of every dimension of the quality of life. It offers students a realistic and necessary context in which to develop and apply their knowledge and approach to their discipline. Community-based teaching also strengthens the university by providing settings for inquiry necessary to advance knowledge in nearly every field of study.

Finally, community-based teaching provides opportunities to strengthen the University District by providing direct services to residents.

New Partnerships: To achieve the goal of establishing the University District as a model teaching community where educational excellence is pervasive, existing partnerships will be extended, broadened, and deepened and new partnerships formed. University faculty and staff, students, residents, and community associations and organizations will be the core for these new partnerships.

Partnerships will be formed within the community to achieve this goal. These partnerships will include existing and new community organizations such as the various "U" groups and neighborhood organizations, as well as religious organizations; youth, family, and senior organizations; block watch and parent groups; and other existing groups and organizations that bring strength, cohesion, and continuity to community life. Schools, health providers, social service providers, and City departments will also be included in the new partnerships established to achieve an exemplary community.

Partnerships are being established within the university to achieve a model teaching community. Linking the academic resources of the university through the Campus Collaborative will be a key element in supporting the central educational mission of the University District. An academic partnership to create this model teaching community will gather and focus the university's human, intellectual, and fiscal resources to:

- Develop opportunities for faculty to become professionally involved in the neighborhoods in:
- Research and inquiry
- Teaching students and mentoring professional colleagues
- Service in community agencies and projects
- Develop opportunities for staff to become involved in the University District by enhancing the likelihood of:
- Patronizing neighborhood agencies, schools, services, and centers
- Volunteer service in the neighborhoods

An academic partnership can include all colleges, schools, and departments of the university. Currently those participating in the Campus Collaborative includes: Architecture, Board of Trustees Committee on Student Affairs, Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, Campus Planning, City and Regional Planning, Council of Graduate Students, Off-Campus Student Services, Education, Federal Relations, Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Health Sciences (including Allied Medical Professions, Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, Optometry, University Hospitals, Veterinary Medicine), Human Ecology, Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, Law, Mereson Center, Ohio State University (OSU) Extension, Public Policy and Management, Rardin Family Practice Center, Social Work, Undergraduate Student Government, University Architects Office, University College, and University Libraries.

Partnerships between the community and the university may be among the most important to create a model teaching community. One such partnership is Campus Partners. Others include expanding or initiating relationships between university colleges, schools, and departments, and community agencies and organizations, public schools, and religious associations. The Campus Collaborative is building these relationships on the common theme of strengthening the entire University District through achieving educational excellence. Faculty, student, and staff participation in the life of the community and resident participation in the life of the university are the key ingredients in developing university-community partnerships.

Research in the Human Services: The human services play a key role in developing and achieving an exemplary teaching community with educational excellence at its heart. The research completed so far by the Campus Collaborative and its four Action Teams in education, employment, health, and social services provides the groundwork for developing the role of the human services in such a community. Fashioning services in the University District in the context of achieving educational excellence is an evolutionary and developmental process which builds on current community resources and adapts as the Neighborhoods' strengths increase.

D. Programs and Concepts

Community-Based Teaching and Inquiry: Increased opportunities for community-based teaching and inquiry in partnership with existing agencies and schools will be developed to provide better services to the Neighborhoods and to prepare students for the human service professions. These will include academic or financial credit; community/site-based interprofessional learning opportunities for graduate and professional students from all interested Ohio State University colleges, schools and departments; the schools of the Greater Columbus Consortium of Theological Schools; and other interested colleges or universities. These learning opportunities will provide expanded opportunities for faculty and graduate student inquiry and research in the University Neighborhoods, including funded research, as well as professional development opportunities and university teaching opportunities for professionals practicing in the University Neighborhoods.

Neighborhood residents will benefit by receiving course-related clinical services and/or instruction. Children and youth in the Neighborhoods will profit from having university resources linked to their schools and service providing agencies. Ohio State students will benefit from formal instruction grounded in practical experience, opportunities for research into urban culture, and access to sites for clinical education. Ohio State faculty will profit from expanded opportunities for community service, professional service, inquiry and research, and clinical instruction sites. Community agencies, schools, and religious organizations will have strengthened linkages through collaboration with each other and Ohio State and expanded resources for teaching and provision of professional services. The university as a whole will also benefit from improved relationships with its neighbors.

The educational excellence of the community and the university will be enhanced by offering site-based courses in the community from a majority of the departments in the university. The long-term potential is for Ohio State to be recognized nationally for its contribution to applied research in urban community building. This program will incorporate living/learning experience for faculty in the University District, including residential opportunities for faculty.

University District Faculty Seed Grant: The University Neighborhoods Faculty Seed Grant program will encourage faculty and graduate student teaching and research in the University District.. All university faculty will be eligible for seed grants. Expenditure guidelines will follow those developed for other university seed grant programs. Resources must be used to support teaching research in the University District neighborhoods. Proposals must demonstrate a potentially positive impact on the neighborhood and/or its residents and the potential for attracting external sources of funding. Support of graduate research assistants will be emphasized in the program.

University faculty and graduate students who participate in the program, as well as their respective departments, will benefit from support of expanded opportunities for teaching and inquiry. Area residents who participate in studies sponsored by this program will increase their knowledge about themselves and their community. The various University District neighborhoods will benefit from the knowledge developed about healthier communities through the teaching and studies supported by this program. Other urban university communities will be able to profit from knowledge and teaching models developed in this program that can be applied to similar situations.

The impact of this program will include the creation of new teaching models and S studies conducted in the context of urban university neighborhoods. It will mean an increase in the number of campus area residents and professionals being included in university research projects, as well as additional faculty and students participating in the University District.

Core Value #2: The University District shall be a place of pride by maintaining buildings, and conserving and enhancing architectural quality and character.

This is one of three chapters that address the character, integrity, and visual quality of the Neighborhoods. Issues surrounding code enforcement, the degradation of the open space, and accumulation of trash, litter, and graffiti can have a profound effect on the quality of life for the residents, and accelerate the decline of the Neighborhoods. In addition, a poorly perceived image can send a negative image to potential students and faculty desiring to live in the Neighborhoods, as well as potential investors in residential and commercial property. The issues and recommendations suggested in each of these areas are critical to the success of the revitalization concept.

Code Enforcement

The city of Columbus has codes intended to protect the life, health, safety, and welfare of its residents. The Building Code, Zoning Code, Housing Code, and Health Code set the standards by which development must conform. The University Neighborhoods have a disproportionate share of code violations stemming from the conversion of single-family dwellings to rooming houses and other such dwelling units. Chapter 2.0 examines the issues surrounding the conversions, and suggests methods to increase the results from a more systematic approach to code enforcement.

Parks and Greenways

The health of any inner-city neighborhood is often tied to the accessibility of adequately sized public parks and open spaces. The University Neighborhoods suffer from a shortage of parks, and also from access to natural areas. Further compounding the park shortage is the lack of greenways that link open spaces, neighborhoods, and important community centers such as university and community services. Chapter 3.0 describes where parks can be added in the Neighborhoods and what streets should function as greenways.

Trash/Solid Waste Collection

Perhaps one of the most essential services in any inner-city neighborhood is the removal of trash. Due to the high proportion of rental units and constant turnover of those units, trash collection and removal of bulk items such as old couches and other discarded furniture is magnified. In addition, with the increase in blighted properties in the Neighborhoods has come graffiti and litter of both private and public property. Constant monitoring of the visual quality of the Neighborhoods is essential to restoring a clean, attractive community. The recent street cleaning activities are an example of the initial actions that will serve as the foundation for the recommendations included within this concept, as addressed in Chapter 4.0.

2.0 CODE ENFORCEMENT

A. Objectives

To minimize the current set of challenges associated with the Columbus code enforcement system, several objectives were drafted. These objectives were derived in response to the University District's very complex code enforcement experience.

The Ohio State University's large urban campus presents a unique collection of demands that call for strategic planning as an enforcement tool. The use of this methodology, in this context, is fairly new to local government. However, with the national trend of doing more with less, it presents a practical approach toward

efficiently managing code enforcement. Strategic Planning is used extensively in private business as a means of assessing market demands and designing products. In the management of local government, the strategic approach is designed to inventory issues, establish priorities, allocate resources, assign responsibility, set measurable goals, and ultimately evaluate success.

The recommendations comprise a comprehensive, multifaceted approach, based largely upon the principles of strategic planning, to bring all properties into compliance. Foremost, there will be policy recommendations that embody the protection of life, health, welfare, and equal protection under the law. The larger policy objectives involve elimination of illegal conversions and developing a policy for recognizing and ensuring safe occupancy of existing conversions. The objectives are summarized below.

Objective 1: Create a comprehensive systematic program to facilitate a more proactive role by code enforcement.

Objective 2: Establish clear policy and procedures to resolve and manage illegally converted properties and code enforcement practices and procedures.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 2.1: Examine the current code enforcement program and procedures, and raise the level of fair and tough enforcement.

Recommendation 2.1.1: Improve/strengthen the current code enforcement program through revisions to the code language and changes in enforcement.

Policy 2.2: Implement a pilot program geared specifically to the University District that is systematic, innovative, and responsive to the issues of code enforcement.

Recommendation 2.2.1: Institute a University District Pilot Code Enforcement Program.. Geographic boundaries should include the entire University District, but as a minimum should start in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 2.2.2: Provide the resources for code enforcement personnel.

Recommendation 2.2.3: Institute a Case Management System.

Recommendation 2.2.4: Provide cross-training of all inspectors.

Recommendation 2.2.5: Create technical and financial assistance incentives.

Recommendation 2.2.6: Develop and implement a Public Information Program.

Recommendation 2.2.7: Provide incentives for property owners who address code violations.

Recommendation 2.2.8: Explore new approaches to noise abatement in the University District.

C. Setting and Current Issues

History: The historical context defining the current development pattern in the University District has its foundation in a pattern of conversions designed to accommodate the high volume student housing demand. First initiated to serve the returning GI's after World War II (1945), area homeowners were encouraged to make rooms available to servicemen attending The Ohio State University who enrolled under the GI Bill. Conversions during this period were often done so without benefit of formal city knowledge or approvals. For example, houses currently considered to be 5 - 6 unit dwellings are recorded in the official building records as a 1 - 2 unit dwelling. Current official building records are considered by many to be incomplete since they do not reflect what is actually the case.

Illegally converted units have persisted in the university area because property owners allow six or more unrelated individuals to enter a single lease as a "family" thereby overriding the need for a rooming house designation. A potential strategy for alleviating the continued practice of illegal conversions would be to establish a consistent family definition among codes.

As a moderate- to low-income college community, this area has suffered from housing congestion over the years. Many owners, with the interest of expanded income, converted garages, attics, and basements to create additional housing units. Developers redeveloped available properties by expanding the number of dwelling units per lot. This intensive pattern of both development and redevelopment compounds the problem.

After 1959, the Columbus Code regulated existing housing and required inspection and licensing of rooming houses. This resulted in recorded licenses for many dwelling units. However, many of the units with permits may potentially be in violation of other codes, such as the Columbus Zoning, Housing, Health and Building Codes. While this period marks the start of the official building records, a significant number of records do not reflect accurate histories.

Prior to 1977, many residences were converted to multi-family uses without any permits or with mechanical permits only (electrical, plumbing, heating, etc.). These permits were issued and work inspected without regard to zoning requirements and without a certificate of occupancy for the new (multi-family) use. Another reason for the persistence of this problem can be traced to the 1959, Council enacted, zoning category AR-4, which produced a green flag for high-density developers in the University District. However, most conversions did not meet AR-4 standards.

Without a formal monitoring process in place to alert all enforcement agencies of applications, many owners chose the quickest way to convert their properties seeking mechanical permits. Only after 1977 when the building permit process was brought into the Development Department with zoning did the process begin to change. This was done even when necessary zoning (Council & Board of Zoning Adjustment) variances were granted because of the difficulty in meeting building code requirements for the new uses.

This recap of history is an attempt to identify primary circumstances that led to the current level of illegal conversions and code violations. While history is an important indicator, accuracy is always a problem; the university area is plagued with a disproportionate share of illegal conversions, code violations, and lack of a clear permitting history. The exact number cannot be determined without an extensive survey.

Persistence of Problem: A formal link was forged in the enforcement process with the consolidation of housing, zoning, and building code enforcement under the City's Development Regulation Division in 1978. However, conversions that took place during that 17-year period (1959-1977), as well as current illegal conversions, remain a problem yet to be effectively addressed.

Currently, rooming house/multi-family owners must prove that the current use has been in place since approximately 1920, or that proper licensing has been in place, including a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for a specified time. Previous lack of coordination among city departments (or endorsement agencies - e.g., Housing, Building & Zoning) permitted many units to have permits without CO, or licensing without variances, zoning clearance, and CO.

Future Activity: Code enforcement dynamics in the University District encompass many facets that contribute to a safe, sanitary living environment. There is a need for more systematic enforcement of the code violations and code correction as a way to preserve the District Neighborhoods. The University District's diverse populations seek varied solutions to these challenges; students desire a safe, comfortable learning environment, while permanent residents seek a quality living environment with opportunities in self sufficiency, homeownership, safety and educational/economic opportunities, and a contemporary urban lifestyle. Additionally, the dilemma of a large population concentrated in a small area exacerbates the problems facing the university District Neighborhoods. Execution of the proposed recommendations are intended to meet the demands of this diverse population. Recommendations should address historical/grandfather issues, existing code violations, and prevention of continued illegal conversions.

Code Enforcement in Columbus: Code enforcement is defined as the process by which public agencies comply with those laws, regulations, and permits over which they have authority. It represents an effective tool for addressing problems related to the living environment. Housing, zoning, building, and health codes are specialized areas of code enforcement. Code enforcement officers of the Regulation Division enforce zoning, housing, and building codes. Their counterparts at the Health Department enforce the health/environmental laws.

No clear policy or procedure for addressing illegal conversions has been established; history has left this problem that somehow must be corrected. Grandfathering in most cases would be the method for correction; however, in this situation, life, health, safety and welfare must take precedence, and therefore, the grandfathering practice reads: "Buildings and structures in existence at the time of adoption of this code may have their existing use continued if such use was legal at the time of the adoption of this code, *provided such continued use is not dangerous to life.*" (CABO, section R-114 Existing Installations).

A policy needs to be established to address historical conversions. One methodology would be to provide more detailed training for all code enforcement officers in the area of code interpretation, especially as it pertains to the unique issues of the University District.

There is need for improved use of Environmental Court. The Environmental Court is seeing less than 50% of all cases they are capable of reviewing. All cases submitted by the Regulation Division and Health Department are not being brought to the court by the City Attorney's Office. Vague code language and insufficient interpretation skills of the inspectors in writing the violations may be the reason for many cases not reaching court. Other times, the Prosecutor may not feel secure about a definite conviction. Definitions of use of property/zoning and others are generally vague and tend to favor the rights of the property owners; correction of this particular problem is very difficult because of the prevailing political attitudes which tend to support the individual's property rights. Any code amendment is subject to the equal protection provisions. Generally, zoning laws are written in the permissive tense. Restrictive law must be carefully written to stand up under the equal protection test.

Current Problems: Generally, all codes address and pursue the protection of life, health, safety, and welfare. The Columbus City Codes that address housing and related activities are embodied within the building, zoning, housing, and health codes.

- **Building Code:** Review of the Columbus City Code revealed no major irregularities; it follows the standard national model. While Columbus's Building Codes carry the strongest reprimand for offenders, only 2% of all citations in the University District were building code violations (DRD 1995). The Building Code addresses the structural soundness of a building, including all of its major components (i.e., electrical, plumbing, and HVAC). The inspectors receive very specialized training and generally are involved largely in new construction. The explanation for such an extremely low citation rate has to do with coordination/referral problems. Once the Code Enforcement Officers (CEO) identify a potential building violation, they write it up and give it to the building inspection section where it is rerouted and scheduled to accommodate the building inspector's schedule, which may or may not be within a reasonable time-frame. The same problem exists for other areas (i.e., health and zoning).
- **Zoning Code:** The Zoning Code deals primarily with land use and exterior building activities. It accounts for approximately 19% of all citation activity in the University District. The Overlay Zoning adopted in 1992 creates a layer of zoning superimposed over the underlying zoning classifications to correct future activities within the university area. It includes regulations for both single-family and apartment districts. Additional areas addressed by the overlay include refuse area locations and maximum densities for apartments (cannot exceed more than one dwelling unit per 700 sq. ft lot. and for licensed rooming houses, no more than one occupant for each 400 sq. ft. of lot area). The overlay zone establishes a University Area Review Board to review all permit applications for site improvements, construction, and exterior alterations (see Chapter Five, Land Use and Zoning section).
- **Housing Code.** The Housing Code is designed to ensure minimum dwelling standards of every occupied housing unit and generally, it requires the minimum Federal Housing Section 8 Standards. Essentials like water, heat, and bedrooms per person are all protected by this code. Review of both the Columbus City Code and the Council of American Building Officials (CABO) – One and Two

- Family Dwelling Code, revealed no major irregularities. Housing standards are acceptable and essentially follow the CABO standard. However, the Housing Code lacks two important elements: (1) a definition of family (see Code Comparison Table); and (2) severe penalties that remain with the owner, even if the structure is sold and/or condemned.
- **Health Code.** The Columbus City Health Code seeks to abate environmental health code violations. Equipped with enforcement powers, health department sanitarians combat issues related to health, including noise, sanitation, and refuse requirements. Community-oriented, the Health Department has an education section that disseminates information in the community along with the Community Liaison. Project Ohio State is a systematic code enforcement approach. Sanitation and refuse issues are further addressed in the Waste Management component of this Revitalization Plan (see Section 4.0).

Code Enforcement: Code enforcement is inextricably linked to the success of clearing all illegal activities (interior and exterior). Columbus' Environmental Court has been created to provide strength and legitimacy to code enforcement activity. The community at-large also plays a role in the success of code enforcement. After extensive interviews with responsible city employees (past and present), non-profit organizations, area developers, and community representatives, the following was found:

- The community perceives code enforcement as inconsistent. While the university area has four assigned CEOs, their workload is primarily complaint-driven; the remainder of their time is spent doing research, title searches, making personal delivery of orders, going to court, and verifying compliance, leaving little time for routine site visits.
- Illegal conversions are not currently being cited because there is no clear City policy or directive on how to handle them.
- The Environmental Court plays a role in the inability to enforce codes in that a percentage of the citations brought to court are eliminated as questionable cases. Currently, there is no evaluation comparing the number of cases filed versus the number of cases tried.
- Comparatively, there are very few Health Department cases being filed with the court. The current reorganization of the Health Department (sanitarians) has placed a new emphasis on the code enforcement and the number of cases filed. However, the basic working philosophy of this department is one that seeks to resolve the problem before it gets to court.
- Questionable conversions innocently purchased have become a threat to the campus real estate market (i.e., banks prefer not to make loans for uses resulting from illegal or undocumented conversions). The City allowed many conversions with mechanical permits but which did not receive a CO. Therefore, owners should be told that if they allow a safety inspection and make corrections, the record will be clarified. This should be a purely administrative procedure. There would then be a record of the legal use and these properties could again be good real estate investments rather than a burden.

Reactive vs. Proactive: Many University District homeowners view code enforcement as the most critical need in the District. Nearly half of the responses to a "Public Service Task Force" survey indicated a belief that strong enforcement could resolve many neighborhood problems by reducing densities and addressing other violations that threaten the quality of life, health, and safety of its residents. The failure of the current code enforcement activity in the campus area is based on several reasons:

- No proactive means to address code violations, particularly illegal conversions without proper permits. (Property maintenance, however, is a greater problem as evidenced by existing conditions, vacant properties, and tax delinquency);
- Need for more training and interpretation skills on the part of the CEOs;
- No clear policy or procedure for citing illegally converted units. Specific wording is needed within the City Code to address inconsistencies (i.e., family and the maximum number of unrelated individuals allowed in a rooming house/single-family units);
- Lack of community legitimacy. There is the perception that code enforcement is ineffective; and
- Clear policy for dealing with boarded-up and dilapidated properties.

D. Programs and Concepts

Institute a University District Pilot Code Enforcement Program: The program would be created to meet the special needs of the University District as well as provide the City the opportunity to test various management and professional approaches to code enforcement that could later be adopted City-wide. An important feature of the program would be a task force for policy input. The task force should be composed of leadership from the City enforcement agencies and representatives from the University District Neighborhoods. An additional component of this effort would include the engagement of a legal consultant to assist in drafting code language improvements. There is an ongoing need to have codes reviewed and language improved to meet the basic needs of the community. Typically, these improvements to the code language are made by comparing the language of other cities and drafting a revision for local review and approval process. The recommendation is to engage a legal consultant knowledgeable in codes to assist the Development Regulations Division in drafting necessary revisions for consideration. An alternative approach could be a relationship with the Ohio State Law School that could serve as a clinic opportunity.

Establish a Systematic Enforcement Approach as a Part of the Pilot Code Enforcement Program: This approach will reorient the enforcement process from a complaint driven system to a geographic based system with a priority ranking of areas to be addressed. Further, a high level of coordination and cooperation is required from the various enforcement agencies that would include areas such as: health, building, housing, public safety, solid waste and social services.

Baseline Inventory of Workload: As input into the design of the Systematic Code Enforcement Program, it is suggested that a code enforcement survey of the University District Pilot Area be undertaken to ascertain the nature and magnitude of violations by sub-area. This information, along with other input from the census data and records of Development Regulations Division and the Health Department, will assist in the prioritization of blocks for systematic inspection.

Prepare and secure approvals for the Policies and Procedures for the Systematic Enforcement Program: Draft the modifications necessary to the current policies and procedures for the various enforcement agencies to adjust to the systematic program. Once drafted, the modifications should be reviewed and adjusted to incorporate the comments from the task force prior to securing the appropriate approvals. This process should be accomplished within a six-month period (two to three months for drafting and three to four months for approvals).

Develop and Implement a Public Information Program: Design and implement a public information program to inform the community and more specifically the University District Pilot Code Enforcement area residents and owners of the new systematic program. The campaign should stress the importance of the codes to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the community and the role of the Environmental Court in the enforcement process. However, the primary emphasis of the campaign should be directed toward a positive approach to achieve compliance identifying the resources, both technical and financial to help property owners.

Institute a Case Management System: The Development Regulations Division should establish a case management system that assigns a "manager" or contact person for the property owner receiving the notice of violation. The case manager will be a well-trained individual knowledgeable of all City codes and capable of assisting the cited person, and resolving the problem regardless of which City agency issued the notice. The manager will oversee the campus survey as well as facilitate the digital transfer of information.

Cross Training of All Inspectors: All enforcement inspectors should receive ongoing training in their area of expertise as well as in the other codes being enforced in the University District pilot program. The training should upgrade their knowledge in areas outside of area of specialty, code interpretation skills, and the ability to write violations that are prosecuted.

Implementation Resources: Currently there are four code enforcement officers working in the University District as a part of the larger four districts for which they are responsible. It is recommended that two additional officers be hired to facilitate the Systematic Enforcement Program while continuing to respond to

filed complaints. The City has initiated the design and implementation of a management information system that will be incorporated in the process when available.

Technical and Financial Assistance Incentives: To facilitate the improvement of property to meet the various City codes, an incentive program is recommended. The incentives will take two forms: first, technical assistance to help property owners determine the proper solution to their property's problems and second, financial assistance to implement the improvements. The City's Neighborhood Development Division currently has a program funded by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program which provides this assistance. Portions of the University District are within the CDBG target area and can be assisted through that program.

Establish an Amnesty Program for Conversions: Linked to the District-wide public information campaign, extend an invitation to owners with rooming house and apartment conversions, or those who believe they may have violations to come forward without penalty. This, along with the technical and financial assistance and the possibility of establishing the use of the property in the building record, should be adequate incentives to have owners come forward. The amnesty should be effective only for a 12-month period, and would still require properties be brought up to code.

Annual Certification of Code Compliance: A voluntary program for property owners who rent or lease to Ohio State students to secure an annual certification and emblem verifying that a particular unit or building meets all City codes. The intent of the program is to give students an added level of assurance regarding the safety features of a particular building. Staff would list only those properties that have the certificate through the Off-Campus Student Services office.

3.0 PARKS AND GREENWAYS

A. Objectives

One of the most obvious physical issues associated with the University Neighborhoods is the lack of open space and parks; indeed, there is a significant shortage based on even Columbus' own standards. The health of a community is often gauged by access to and the amount of natural and developed park and open spaces. The University District also suffers from a lack of "green streets" or landscaped paths that could provide connections to important places such as the Ohio State campus and community centers, distinguish neighborhood boundaries, and encourage pedestrian vs. automobile transportation.

The following objectives will guide Campus Partners, the City, and the university in developing a parks and open space component to the Revitalization Plan:

Objective 1: Increase the amount of park and open space within the University Neighborhoods to reflect the standards as identified by the city of Columbus.

Objective 2: Develop a system of "greenways" within the Neighborhoods that will serve as important streets and paths and link individual neighborhoods parks and the overall District.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 3.1: Identify parcels within the University Neighborhoods that can be acquired and converted into public parks and open space to achieve a net increase of five acres per neighborhood.

Recommendation 3.1.1: Locate a large public park central to the Indianola, Weinland Park, and East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 3.1.2: Identify small parcels on a block-by-block basis for pocket parks. However, development should only occur when clear ownership and maintenance responsibilities have been established.

Recommendation 3.1.3: Expand Indianola Middle School grounds south to 18th Avenue.

Recommendation 3.1.4: Expand Weinland Park to include the entire block between the Fourth and Summit Street pairs, on the south side of 7th Avenue. This policy is established in the University Area Plan.

Recommendation 3.1.5: Explore creation of a new park north of the existing fire station on the west side of Indianola Avenue between 8th and 9th Avenues.

Recommendation 3.1.6: Rehabilitate the Iuka Ravine with landscape and lighting improvements.

Recommendation 3.1.7: Create small, vest pocket parks along High Street at key roadway street closures.

Recommendation 3.1.8: Develop an Ohio State outreach program to permit community use of campus recreation facilities, and assure they are available.

Recommendation 3.1.9: Develop recreational facilities for students in the Neighborhoods as an extension of university programs.

Policy 3.2: Create "greenways" in the Neighborhoods that follow existing streets and connect significant parks, community centers, and the Ohio State campus and Oval.

Recommendation 3.2.1: Develop greenways along 15th Avenue; East 12th Avenue;; Summit Street; Fourth Street; Indianola Avenue; East Woodruff Avenue; Lane Avenue; East 11th Avenue; Seventh/King Avenue, West Tenth Avenue, Patterson Avenue, Neil Avenue, Arcadia Avenue and High Street, including coordinated street tree programs, new lighting and signage.

Recommendation 3.2.2: Develop a series of gateway treatments that may be simple landscape or signage solutions to announce entrance to the University District. Recommended locations include Conrail Underpass at East 11th Avenue, East 17th Avenue, and Hudson Avenue; the Lane Avenue Bridge. Architectural Gateway solutions should be incorporated in new or renovated structures at East Ninth Avenue and High Street and Norwich Avenue and High Street.

C. Setting and Current Issues

The University Neighborhoods are underserved by open space and public amenities. The current deficit exacerbates the appearance of congestion and blight, and results in idle youth conducting illicit activities in some neighborhoods, and overgrown front yards converted to volleyball courts in the East, South and North Campus Neighborhoods. In addition, there is no organized street tree planting program to reinforce key pedestrian streets in the Neighborhoods

Based on the City's standards for open space of 10 acres per 1,000 residents, the University Neighborhoods requires over 200 acres of open space. Weinland Park, south of 7th Avenue between Fourth and Summit Street one-way pairs, is the only City-owned neighborhood park within the entire study area. City-owned and maintained athletic fields are provided in Tuttle Park, on the west bank of the Olentangy River just north of campus. Other open space includes a new community-built playground at the Indianola Middle School.

The following summary shows just how acute the shortage of open space is when population and open space are compared in each of the six proposed neighborhoods. The analysis shows that only 10% of the required open space based on existing population is currently provided within the Neighborhoods.

	Indianola Terrace	Iuka Ravine / Indianola Forests	South Campus	East Campus	Weinland Park East	Weinland Park West
Population (per 1990 Census)	4,369	3,313	3,403	6,034	2,225	2,295
Existing Open Space (acres)	8	4	3.9	0.4	4.7	0.6
Recommended Open Space (per City standards)	43.69	33.13	34.03	60.34	22.25	22.95
Surplus/Deficit	(-35.69)	(-29.13)	(-30.13)	(-59.94)	(-17.55)	(-22.35)

Note: Totals do not include Tuttle Park (38 acres) and University Facilities (115 acres) as they lie outside of neighborhoods analyzed.

The study area does, however, include one of the most impressive natural landforms in the City. The Iuka Ravine, which stretches from the intersection of 16th Avenue and Pearl Street to Fourth Street in the northeast corner of the study area, provides a striking contrast in topography to its relatively flat surroundings. In particular, it forces a curved alignment of adjoining streets and provides an attractive contrast to the dense, gridiron layout of District streets. It contains a public street which is paved in a richly mottled brick paving. However, deterioration of the Indianola Avenue overpass has cut off vehicular circulation along Iuka Avenue, resulting in a dead end condition until the bridge is repaired (currently underway). This condition, coupled with the fact that the space within the ravine receives little maintenance, pathways are poorly lighted, and its edges are overgrown, greatly diminishes its use as the area's major open space feature.

The Ohio State campus, in contrast to the University District, is blessed with vast acreages of open space. While written policies do not preclude neighborhood use of campus facilities, operating limitations (e.g., students take precedent over residents in scheduling athletic facilities, which effectively eliminates any neighborhood use) and philosophic approaches (e.g., the Oval is rarely used to host neighborhood functions) have essentially separated Ohio State from the community's major open space elements.

D. Programs and Concepts

The intent of the Revitalization Plan is to not only identify where parks and open spaces can be added to the Neighborhoods, but to emphasize the importance of those spaces in an urban environment. The quality of life in any urban area is significantly increased by the addition of access to recreational opportunities and the natural environment.

The Revitalization Plan identifies several locations within the Neighborhoods that would be suitable for future park spaces, and significant streets that could be converted to greenways as pedestrian and bicycle corridors.

While these improvements will help solve some of the open space shortages in the Neighborhoods, providing a minimum of five new acres of open space per neighborhood should be established as a revitalization goal. The benefit of this amount of open space will result in not only an improved quality of life, but if properly designed, will go a long way to helping to relieve overtaxed storm drainage capacity within the Neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Parks

Indianola Middle School Park. One of the major green space initiatives for Indianola Terrace entails leveraging improvements already made to the Indianola Middle School park in the summer of 1995. Additional improvements will include expanding the park south to 18th Avenue to displace non-conforming uses that are incompatible with family residences and the middle school. Other revisions include providing direct pedestrian and bicycle access from Lane and 20th Avenues, both of which currently dead end at the park, as well as opening up the north end of the park visually and providing parking spaces off of Norwich Avenue to improve both access, surveillance, and safety.

12th Avenue Park. The old commercial center just south of 12th Avenue between Fourth and Summit should be redeveloped into a park, addressing a severe need for public space by surrounding neighborhoods while also displacing an underutilized, poorly located commercial site. The park will enhance the property values of adjacent residences, while providing a common space for the Weinland Park, East, South and North Campus, and Indianola Terrace neighborhoods. The location is further enhanced by the removal of arterial traffic from 12th Avenue. The existing commercial uses should be relocated to the new neighborhood center, located directly south where the site is both more visible and accessible to traffic.

Weinland Park. Weinland Park should be expanded to include the entire block between the Fourth and Summit Street pairs, on the south side of East 7th Avenue. Expansion of the park will make better use as a part-time parking lot and capture existing tax delinquent properties while providing increased opportunities for community, cultural, and recreational activity.

Indianola/8th Avenue Park. A series of blighted, crime ridden, tax delinquent properties along the west side of Indianola Avenue between East 8th and East 9th Avenues could be replaced by a two-acre neighborhood park that will adjoin the existing fire station, a church, and the Community Directions for Youth center. The park would provide a new focus for a struggling neighborhood, while creating an anchor for the surrounding homeownership incentive zone.

Godman Guild East. The area surrounding the headquarters of the Godman Guild East should be redeveloped into a higher quality neighborhood park or playground, displacing much of the existing asphalt parking lot. Improvement of this park has been considered for some time but lack of sufficient funding to become a reality has hampered implementation.

High Street. There are three locations along High Street where plazas are suggested in the Revitalization Plan. These plazas would occur where the east/west streets of 16th, 14th and 13th Avenues terminate at High Street. These areas should be developed as plazas and programmed for cart vendors and movable furniture. The plazas should be maintained by the Special Improvement District.

Iuka Ravine: Perhaps the most significant natural feature remaining in the University Neighborhoods is Iuka Ravine. The long-term health and protection of the ravine should be a high priority in the Neighborhoods. Currently suffering from low maintenance, poor lighting, and security concerns, the unique topographic feature is in danger of falling into severe neglect. A Master Plan that demonstrates a conservation and rehabilitation strategy as well as offers design guidelines for future improvements should be developed.

Greenways: Significant streets within the Neighborhoods that should receive landscape and other amenity upgrades include East 15th Avenue, East 12th Avenue, Summit Street, Fourth Street, Indianola Avenue, East Woodruff Avenue, Lane Avenue, 7th/ King Avenue, and West 10th Avenue. In particular, 15th Avenue should feature a double row of street trees and historic lighting standards to highlight its importance as a ceremonial corridor leading from the District's eastern edge into the Ohio State Oval and campus.

Greenways will also connect commercial and human service centers in the Neighborhoods to help anchor homeownership and affordable rental zones. The West 10th Avenue greenway will establish an edge to the campus that is currently fragmented and negatively impacts the neighborhood to the South.

4.0 TRASH/SOLID WASTE COLLECTION

A. Objectives

While the problem of increased trash in the Neighborhoods has many causes, it is essential that the problem be solved. The perception among most residents and students who live in the area is that the problem has worsened, creating a negative image. To attract investment to the University District, the streets, alleys, and buildings must be regularly cleaned and maintained. Recent success in developing a street cleaning program is an example of positive change.

This chapter examines not only the issue of trash collection, but also City policies and programs on bulk refuse collection, litter of public and private property, and graffiti concerns. The following objectives guide the policies and recommendations of trash/solid waste collection:

Objective 1: Provide for clean, well-maintained University Neighborhoods with removal of trash and bulk solid waste on a regular basis.

Objective 2: Remove litter and graffiti from the University Neighborhoods.

Objective 3: Make code enforcement a priority in the Refuse Collection Division.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 4.1: Increase the effectiveness and regularity of trash collection services to the University Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 4.1.1: The city of Columbus should provide twice weekly trash collection in the Neighborhoods, particularly during the school year (September to June).

Recommendation 4.1.2: Increase the frequency of bulk collection on a seasonal basis coinciding with changes in the university schedule.

Recommendation 4.1.3: The City should evaluate alternatives to its waste container registration program due to the difficulty in enforcing the current ordinance.

Recommendations 4.1.4: Designate a person responsible for refuse container and repair in the Neighborhoods within the Division of Refuse Collection.

Recommendations 4.1.5: Encourage continued funding within the City's Division of Refuse Collection for vehicle replacement and acquisition.

Recommendations 4.1.6: Establish a Solid Waste Service Fee Structure with revenues dedicated to funding solid waste/trash/and garbage collection services. Any fees should be comprehensive and equitable.

Policy 4.2: Encourage tighter control over the widespread problem of graffiti and litter, and enact legislation to discourage further degradation within the Neighborhoods.

Recommendations 4.2.1: The City should enact legislation that restricts deposition of litter on private and public property.

Recommendations 4.2.2: The City should review existing code requirements relating to deposition of litter and increase the requirements and penalties where appropriate.

Recommendations 4.2.3: Institute policies and programs to address graffiti on public and private property.

Policy 4.3: Code enforcement issues as they relate to public health and waste should be reviewed and changed as necessary to provide better control over public services.

Recommendations 4.3.1: Establish a code enforcement program with authority in the Refuse Collection division related to Solid Waste Management.

Recommendations 4.3.2: The city of Columbus should review its present functional department structure for the regulation of health, environmental, waste, building codes and inspections and assess the potential to combine programs for better efficiency and effectiveness.

C. Setting and Current Issues

The city of Columbus provides solid waste collection services to residences and properties as defined by classes of services delineated in the Columbus City Code. These classes of services may be broadly categorized as single-family residential structures, multi-family residential structures, rooming/boarding houses, multi-unit residential structures, and some businesses.

The City provides solid waste collection services through the Department of Public Service. The Division of Refuse Collection was established as a unit of the Department of Public Service with its primary duty being the collection of refuse. The City Code includes specific requirements for the responsibility, control, storage, and collection of solid waste by generators of waste materials and delineates the responsibilities of the City for the collection of these waste materials. The code also includes specific requirements, with respect to waste materials, for persons living, working, and doing business in the city of Columbus.

The Department of Public Service is organized into several divisions and is responsible for the delivery of a multitude of public services, including street maintenance and construction, traffic engineering, capital works engineering and construction, street cleaning, street sweeping, City engineering and permitting functions, and refuse collection. The Division of Refuse Collection of the Public Service Department has the primary responsibility for the collection of refuse within the corporate limits of the city of Columbus. The Division has a total staff of 271 full-time employees and 59 part-time employees. The Division's 1996 operating budget or Continuing Service Estimate is over \$19.4 million. Its Capital Improvements budget (purchase of equipment and containers) is over \$3.2 million.

Refuse collection is structured on a geographical basis to provide the waste collection services mandated by the code. It currently operates from four installations, including the Alum Creek Road Facility, which serves as headquarters for the Division; the Georgesville Road; the Morse Road Facility; and the Marion Road Facility. The Morse Road Facility provides collection services from 90- and 300-gallon containers in the University District. The Georgesville Road Facility provides box collection services for this same area. The Division provides collection services along with other providers of these services.

The University District is somewhat unique in that it contains The Ohio State University, with a large off-campus student population residing close to the university. In the past, residents and business owners/operators have expressed concerns regarding the level of trash generation and accumulation in the university area. Field surveys of the university area resulted in the conclusion that there is justification and validity with the assertions of trash as a major problem and indicated that the level of trash accumulation in the area may be higher than desirable during normal times, and especially during changes in the academic periods of the university.

Some of the concerns expressed have related to, among others, overflowing box containers with adjacent build-up of trash, trash accumulation around the 300-gallon containers, proliferation of bulk materials in alleys during certain periods, random deposition of waste materials in alleys, trash and litter on the streets, and vacant lots in the area.

Over time many of those affected have expressed numerous reasons for the current problems. These include:

- The transient population resulting from residency of students in the area.
- Conversion of previous single-family residences to multi-residences for students.
- Proliferation of rooming houses in the area.
- Absentee landlords, who apparently do not control or manage the waste problem.
- Personal habits of students who may not feel a commitment to the area.
- Perceived lack of regular waste collection by public and private entities.
- Random "dumping" by commuters and others traveling through the area.
- Disposal of waste by nearby business owners who may not have required containers.
- Lack of capacity of front-box containers in use by residential and business owners.

Review of Code Requirements: A review of the City Code requirements found they are generally consistent with what should be expected of property owners, tenants and occupants of buildings, premises and businesses with regards to the responsibilities for waste generation, handling, disposal and collection.

The requirements specifically related to the University District may be somewhat unique but are in response to the special circumstances resulting from the higher-than-usual residential density in the area and the cyclical nature of waste generation associated with the changes in academic schedules at The Ohio State University. The requirements for determining container capacity based on gross area of the building or dwelling appear to be reasonable considering the characteristics of the university area, and the fact that structures in the area have increased contribution to the waste stream. However, certain parameters included in the requirements and the formula for determining container size may need to be reviewed to reflect present actual and assumed residential and population density conditions in the University District. Throughout the area, there are external indications of changes in use of structures which previously served single-family residential, but now serve as residential housing for students. Specific data are not readily available on past conversions and the present density of the student population residing in previous single-family residences or properly zoned and constructed multi-family residential structures.

Considering the present requirements of the solid waste management code, the study has found a need for selective revisions of certain code sections; additional code enforcement responsibilities; further definition and delineation of environmental violations as they specifically relate to solid waste management; provision of increased monitoring and enforcement of the requirements imposed on property owners, tenants, occupants of residential structures and businesses in the study area.

The code is not specific on the issue of disposal of bulk waste. It may be that this section relating to the preparation of bundled waste excludes any items beyond those considered. However, given the specific problems that have been identified with the disposal of bulk materials in the university area, the code should contain specific requirements on the responsibilities for collection and disposal of bulk materials.

In addition to the problems noted above with trash/solid waste accumulation and collection, there have been some concerns expressed with increasing litter along expressways and streets in the City; graffiti on public facilities, such as bridges; and the random dumping of waste materials on vacant, and in some cases, developed lots in the city.

Summary of Findings and Analysis: Generally, at times, there has been an excessive accumulation of trash in many alleys throughout the University District. Some of this may be due to the method, timing, and schedule of collection activities in the area. Other causes may be due to the present demographics of the area (i.e., the high concentration of the student population and the distribution of this population within the study area).

The Refuse Collection Division provides collection services to the residents in this area. This service is currently provided through distribution and servicing 300- and 90-gallon containers and dumpsters or box containers. The 300-gallon containers, provided by the City, are usually placed in alleys and used for service to multi-unit structures with four or less units. The 90-gallon containers, provided by the City, furnish service to single residential structures from the curbside using semi-mechanized rear loading equipment. The 300-gallon containers are picked up by a mechanized system utilizing a one-person crew. A one-person crew does not facilitate any efforts to clean up spillage from around the container, resulting in build-up of waste that citizens perceive as a lack of service.

Dumpster containers provide service to multiple-unit structures. The City services these container units once per week. The capacity of some of these containers has been identified as a problem. Any property owner who owns containers that requires servicing more than once per week contracts with private haulers for additional collection service.

The City has recently instituted two programs to improve the capacities and identification of owners of these containers. The City has modified its code to include a method of computing required containers using a formula based on total floor area and number of dwelling units. The City also initiated a survey to identify the owners of existing containers, the number of dwelling units, the capacity of containers, and the required

capacity based on floor area of the structure. The focus will be to identify all dumpsters in the university area and Citywide to develop a computer database to determine sufficient capacity and subsequent remedial action.

Bulk items deposited in the alleys are a major problem. To some extent, generation of bulk waste seems to be cyclical, and dependent on timing of student move-ins and move-outs during changes in the university's academic periods. The Division does not have sufficient crews to handle this problem at present. It was also indicated that the disposal of items having CFCs (e.g., refrigerators, dehumidifiers, air conditioners, etc.) are the responsibility of property owners. The consensus is that landlords should hire commercial firms to clean and dispose of bulk materials in conjunction with move-in and move-out activities.

The Refuse Collection Division has been (and is currently) assigning additional resources to the university area to provide twice-per-week collection services during the periods September-October and March-June. These efforts, to date, have been successful, with a noticeable decrease in the level of waste and bulk accumulation in the study area.

The student population distribution and density may contribute to a higher-than-normal waste volume from converted single-family structures to multiple units. This situation will in all likelihood continue. Any changes to the present system of waste collection should recognize this fact and provide for handling the increased waste stream from the student population in addition to the cyclical deposition of various bulk items.

The Refuse Collection Division has experienced some problems in the past with lack of adequate equipment availability. These problems have been solved through the procurement of new equipment during the past two years. In addition, the City has established a five-year equipment replacement schedule for waste collection vehicles. The existing vehicle replacement program and the recommendation relating thereto is intended to ensure that the City establish and continually fund a scheduled replacement for refuse collection vehicles. The equipment replacement program and the funding thereof should be continuing and not subject to annual budget reviews or competition with other critical municipal funding needs.

The Refuse Collection Division does not have code enforcement responsibilities. Enforcement of refuse problems is performed by the Health Department. The division now has three staff positions (1995) who are assigned to identify violations and work with the Health Department in enforcement activities. One of these positions is assigned to the Morse Road District which includes the university area. The division has been meeting with the Health Department on a regular weekly basis to coordinate and facilitate the enforcement activities between these departments. Given the enforcement problems identified in the study area, the university area could easily support the assignment of a full-time Solid Waste Inspector to the area. Funding for waste collection service is provided from the General Fund. There is no present refuse collection or sanitation fee and no revenues dedicated to their services. Refuse Collection must compete with all other City services for adequate funding.

In many municipalities, funding for waste/refuse collection and disposal services is based on the utilization and requirements for the services provided. That is, those who use the services pay the costs thereof in a commensurate and equitable fashion.

The Environmental Court has capacity to handle more enforcement actions. The court is now operating at less than full capacity. According to reports received, few health-related issues are presented to the court. Additional staff in the Departments of Health and Public Service may effect a shift in the number of cases presented to the court. The court is a resource that could be used to facilitate and enhance the enforcement of laws and regulations relating to environmental matters under the purview of these departments.

D. Programs and Concepts

Provide Twice per Week Collection Service: Some residents of the university area believe that the trash problem being experienced is directly related to the quantity of waste stream being generated and the frequency of collection by the City and private waste collectors. Some of these problems may be due to the frequency of collection and the capacities of the box containers utilized for certain residences. The provision of twice-per-week collection service for certain areas in the university area would significantly reduce trash in the alleys and other public spaces.

For approximately 15 months the City has been providing twice-per-week collection in the university area during the periods of September/October and March through June. Residents and neighborhood groups have recognized and spoken positively of the improved service. Field studies of waste loads on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis have identified July and August as low generation months. Second collections are not required during these two months. This initiative should be continued and funded on an annual basis.

Increase frequency of bulk collection on a seasonal basis coinciding with changes in university schedule: Establish as a minimum service level increased frequency of bulk materials collection in the university area.

The Department has proceeded to provide such increased frequency of bulk collection, albeit within existing budget allocation. This increased service level should be as a basic City service policy with adequate funding and resources provided to the department to ensure the routine and scheduled collection of bulk materials during appropriate periods.

Given the characteristics of the area, it is recommended that two additional bulk crews be added to the area. By adding two additional bulk crews to the crews currently servicing this area, it is felt that the Refuse Collection Division will be able to substantially improve overall bulk collections in the area. In addition to collecting bulk, it is recommended that the bulk crews clean up spillage around dumpsters and 300-gallon containers.

Landlords and operators of student residential properties should be involved in the coordination and scheduling of residential "change-outs" which contribute to peak generation of bulk materials. The City should continue or initiate discussions with the Apartment Owners Association and property managers to create a cooperative liaison. Apartment owners should be encouraged to use roll offs or dumpsters with private haulers handling the removal of construction materials and bulk items associated with renovations.

Evaluate Alternatives to the City's Container Registration Program: By ordinance, the City has established a waste container registration program for multi-family structures with more than five residential units. This program requires that owners, occupants, tenants, and operators of housing units provide certain information relating to the number of units, size of the structure, size and capacity of the waste container, specifically, front-box containers, and provide an affidavit to the Refuse Collection Division attesting to the information required. The Refuse Collection Division transmitted approximately 1,250 copies of the survey and affidavit form to then known owners of box containers.

As worded, the City has experienced difficulty in enforcing this ordinance and the Public Service Department is currently revising Title 13 of the Columbus City Codes to address all refuse-related issues, including a Citywide container registration program. Some suggestions currently being discussed are revising the formula to base capacity on maximum number of occupants per dwelling and/or basing the capacity on the number of dwellings units. Solid Waste Inspection personnel may be used in the future to facilitate the enforcement provisions of this program. An annual dumpster decal renewal program is currently being developed to work in conjunction with the container registration program.

Inspection, Maintenance, and Repair of City-Provided Containers: There were concerns expressed for an ongoing program that ensures containers in the area are in the appropriate quantities and properly maintained. The Plan recommends the addition of one Refuse Container and Repair person. Again, this position would be solely dedicated to the University Neighborhoods area. This person would provide immediate response to resident requests for necessary repair, maintenance, or replacement of damaged containers. Of course, this would not include dumpster boxes since they are owned or leased by the property owner/manager. Damaged dumpster boxes would be under the jurisdiction of the assigned Solid Waste Inspector.

During spring and summer, it is recommended that the container and repair person provide a minimum of one cleaning and sanitizing of each 300-gallon container in the area.

Ensure Continued Funding for a Vehicle Replacement Program: The Department of Public Service/Refuse Collection Division has experienced some problems with the availability of collection equipment to provide timely services in various areas of the City. During 1993 and 1994, the division received new replacement equipment which has contributed to its ability to provide scheduled services.

The City implemented a five-year replacement program for waste collection vehicles, currently projected through the year 2000. The City should continue this program and ensure that funding is available to finance replacement of refuse collection vehicles beyond the presently scheduled program.

Establish a Solid Waste Service Fee Structure with Revenues Dedicated to Funding Solid

Waste/Trash/Garbage Collection Services: The city of Columbus does not have a solid waste collection fee structure for services provided to residents and businesses of the City. The City should review the feasibility of establishing a solid waste collection and disposal fee system with the revenues generated to provide waste collection and disposal services to the citizens.

The Department of Public Service has indicated a willingness to initiate a review of the feasibility of a fee-based structure for refuse collection services. The Department anticipates that such a feasibility study could be completed in approximately 24 months.

Enactment of Legislation Relating to Litter on Properties: Excessive litter on private and public property is an area of major concern in the university area and other areas of the City. As noted earlier, this is a main problem relating to alleys in the area, but also relates to undeveloped and developed property in the Study area.

The City should consider the review of the current litter code (2324.01, Littering, unauthorized use of litter receptacle, of the Health, Safety and Sanitation Code) and/or enhancement of the existing legislation to prohibit littering on public and private property and assign responsibility for monitoring, control, and abatement to the Department of Health.

Proposed ordinance enhancements could be based on a declaration of excessive litter as a health problem, a continuing nuisance, and violations of certain environmental standards established by State and local laws. Such legislation has been successful in other jurisdictions but may be dependent on the powers and authorities granted to the City under its charter.

The City can pursue alternative efforts to control, regulate, and abate littering on private and public property. Some of these include the following:

- Consider legislation relating to the deposition and accumulation on private property as the responsibility of the property owner.
- Consider legislation that would classify littering on public and private as a misdemeanor with penalties appropriate to this offense.
- Create monitoring and enforcement resources in the Department of Health with responsibility for review and enforcement of enacted code requirements relating to the deposition of litter on public and private property and excessive vegetative overgrowth on public and private properties.

Control of Litter on Streets, Highways, and Expressways within the City: Some concerns have been expressed relative to problems with excessive litter, trash, and debris on the major streets, highways, and expressways within the City. The main concern relates to excessive deposition of trash along these thoroughfares and also at the exits and entrances. The city of Columbus can attempt to control and monitor those street system elements within its jurisdiction through enactment of legislation as proposed above. The expressways are under the jurisdictions of the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT). All other freeways, including State routes, are the maintenance responsibility of the City.

The City should review existing code requirements related to litter and increase the requirements and penalties where appropriate. It should be noted, however, that laws and regulations in and of themselves are not an effective tool in reducing litter. The most effective mechanism has been the establishment and availability of resources that could be dispatched to abate problems that have been discovered.

Considering experiences in the area of highway litter, the most effective solution is the creation of resources to abate littering along with an intensive campaign to raise public awareness of the cost of littering on the streets and highways of any city. Columbus has pursued an educational program and attempts to involve the public in an anti-littering attitude. Columbus' program is called "Roadside Rainbow" and is structured to solicit

organizations, civic associations, and companies to: (1) design, construct, and maintain landscape areas; (2) maintain landscape areas; or (3) have a program to remove litter from major sections of the roadway.

Institute Policies and Programs to Address Graffiti on Public and Private Property: The City should enforce laws and regulations with respect to graffiti on public and private property. Such efforts will be the most effective deterrent to graffiti, paintings, displays, and other graphics on private and public property. In addition to laws, regulations, and strict enforcement, the city of Columbus must create the resources to obliterate applied graffiti when discovered as soon as possible. This has been demonstrated to be the most effective measure in decreasing the proliferation of graffiti.

The Department of Trade and Development's Division of Development Regulations would appear to be the organization best suited to address graffiti on private property. This division currently has enforcement responsibility and its Environmental Blight Abatement group deals with similar issues in the community. It is recommended that the Public Service Department's Engineering and Construction Division continue their program of graffiti removal from bridges and overpasses.

The creation of new or use of existing resources to monitor and remove graffiti could be an additional cost to the delivery of services. However, given the concerns that have been expressed, this is an area that should be considered for the allocation of necessary resources. Proliferation of graffiti, whether on private or public property can only be viewed as negative and a detriment on the viability of the area in question.

Establish a Code Enforcement Program with Authority in the Refuse Collection Division Related to Solid Waste Management: Enact legislative authority for Refuse Collection Solid Waste Inspectors to have authority and responsibility for identification of code violation and preparation of cases to be presented to the Environmental Court in the area of refuse monitoring, control, and management.

Currently, personnel of the Refuse Collection Division identify waste and trash violations and report these to the code enforcement personnel of the Health Department who prepare cases for the City Attorney's office for presentation to the Environmental Court. This procedure has worked reasonably well in the past; however, considering the increasing problems associated with the proliferation of trash, random dumping on vacant and developed lots, and other expressed concerns, the Department of Public Service should have internal authorities, responsibilities, and resources to address problems and initiate code enforcement activities relating to its area of operations.

The Departments of Health and Public Service have recently added staff to increase enforcement in the areas of solid waste code violations. In addition, these departments have been meeting to ensure appropriate inter-departmental coordination of activities in the area of code requirements relating to refuse and solid waste. The Department of Public Service concurs with the need to establish enforcement authorities in the department and to include one additional Solid Waste Inspector as referenced in the Summary of Finding and Analysis section.

Changes in Regulatory Programs and Requirements: The present assignment of code enforcement, specifically health, building, environmental, and solid waste (trash) among the various departments could potentially create among the citizenry and others some confusion in which department should be contacted with respect to certain problems that may transcend departmental lines and responsibilities.

It is recommended that the city of Columbus review its present functional departmental structure for the regulation of health, environmental, waste, building codes, and inspections and assess the potential for combining these, or alternatively creating an advisory or review committee to evaluate a more efficient and effective method of coordinating and carrying out the enforcement provisions of the present code.

Core Value #3: The University District shall be culturally and socio-economically diverse.

This is one of five chapters that address the intensity and density of development, residential homeownership patterns, availability of community services, access to job resources, and provision of services for students who live in the Neighborhoods. The University District has some of the most diverse neighborhoods in the City, with diversity expressed through broad ranges in levels of income, types of ethnicities established, dependency on community services, and lifestyles. Maintaining that richness of people and culture while meeting the requirements of a clean, safe, and economically stable community is a challenge.

Land Use and Zoning

Through planning instruments such as land use designations and zoning, the city of Columbus can determine the use, intensity, and character of its neighborhoods. Recognizing the need to examine land use and zoning classifications, Chapter 5.0 sets forth some basic recommendations for improving the quality of life in the Neighborhoods and the economic vitality of the High Street Corridor. Positive adjustments to the distribution and intensity of land uses will affect everything from homeownership to parking.

Residential Revitalization

One of the central themes of this Concept Document is stability and improvement in the physical character of the Neighborhoods. An essential goal in carrying out this theme is increasing homeownership. While the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods will continue to serve predominantly the student population, the surrounding communities will require programs and incentives that provide places for residents and university faculty and staff to invest in homeownership. Owning a piece of the neighborhood increases the sense of pride in the surroundings and leads to overall stability. This chapter provides recommendations to facilitate residential revitalization in the Neighborhoods.

Health and Well-Being

The fundamental objectives included within this chapter address health and healthy living for the residents and the infrastructure of community services required for that purpose. Access to adequate health care information and maintenance programs is essential to the well-being of any community. Providing for increased teaching and learning opportunities to enhance the health and well-being of all residents should be a goal of the university and the Neighborhoods.

Employment and Economic Development

Healthy neighborhoods in inner-city environments such as the University Neighborhoods often provide sources of employment for its residents. While this document assumes that some jobs will be created through the revitalization of High Street, it also assumes that opportunities should exist in other parts of the Neighborhoods. This chapter addresses a wide range of approaches to increasing local employment including the possible locations of employers and the programs that need to be created to train and educate residents give them skills necessary to find jobs where available.

Student Quality of Life

The students who live in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods are a resource that should not be ignored. By providing a conduit for the students to become actively engaged in the Neighborhoods, they will ultimately become better neighbors and will be more likely to contribute to community service. A goal of the Plan is to provide students with greater access to community services, thereby strengthening the East, North

and South Campus Neighborhoods as a desirable and safe place to live. This chapter provides recommendations related to enhancing the quality of student life in the Neighborhoods.

5.0 LAND USE AND ZONING

A. Objectives

Developing a strategy for appropriate distribution of land uses that will support the larger goals of the Revitalization Plan is the underlying objective of this section. Successful adjustments to land use will positively affect everything from homeownership to stronger economic vitality on High Street.

Through zoning, which is the primary tool influencing land use, residential uses and commercial intensity around the edge of the university would transition to predominantly lower-density housing in the surrounding areas.

Recommendations are made to effectively induce development of new and more market responsive rental products in the East, South and North Campus Neighborhoods, while conserving existing housing making it more attractive for single-family home ownership and professional or graduate student rental.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 5.1: The unique character of the University District is strongly linked to the varied and historic housing stock that contributes to the architectural character of the Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 5.1.1: Areas currently classified as either AR-4 or R-4 should be examined for downzoning in the following planning areas:

- Weinland Park (east and west) south of East 11th Avenue
- Indianola Terrace east of Fourth Street
- Iuka Ravine/Indianola Forest
- Dennison Place/NECKO including the newly added areas surrounding McMillen Place

Recommendation 5.1.2: In recognition of the need to conserve the architectural character of the area, FAR bonuses should be maintained for adaptive re-use of contributing structures within the East, North, and South Campus Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 5.1.3: A strategy needs to be developed for identifying, prioritizing, and removing non-residential properties, whose current non-permitted use conflicts with current zoning classifications.

Recommendation 5.1.4: The boundaries of the University Impact District should be expanded to ideally coincide with the boundaries of the University District, but as a minimum be designed to include areas most susceptible to in appropriate development given successful revitalization momentum and new investment in the District.

Policy 5.2: The University District Overlay has positively influenced the Neighborhoods by discouraging inappropriate development and providing incentives to rehabilitate older properties. The intent of the Overlay should be maintained and its ease of understanding for compliance should be improved.

Recommendation 5.2.1: A public relations program should be developed to communicate the objectives, intent, how to use, and the benefits of the Overlay to new homeowners, developers, and investors.

Recommendation 5.2.2: Technical assistance from sources such as the NDAC, The Ohio State University schools of Planning and Architecture, as well as the University Area Review Board should be available at no cost or low cost to single-family homeowners and purchasers who wish to renovate property or bring their property up to code but are unsure how to work with or interpret the Overlay.

Recommendation 5.2.3: To provide incentives for removing problem properties or creating new development consistent with the objectives of the proposed Mixed Use areas, aggregation of several lots should be considered at the project proposal level, provided new development emanates from High Street. In return for the right to combine lots, new development should provide increased levels of open space and parking.

Policy 5.3: To effectively attract new single-family homeowners to specific neighborhoods, problem properties, illegal conversions, and 'de facto' rooming houses will need to be rehabilitated or replaced with single-family housing.

Recommendation 5.3.1: A task force of neighborhood representatives, city of Columbus Code Enforcement Officers, and the City's Attorney office need to identify and prioritize problem properties and work to remove or upgrade the worst offenders.

Recommendation 5.3.2: Campus Partners, working with funding from the city of Columbus, The Ohio State University, and private banking institutions should acquire the worst problem properties (as identified by the proposed Task Force in Recommendation 5.3.1) and facilitate their rehabilitation to single-family homes, if appropriate, or completely remove them.

Recommendation 5.3.3: A Transfer of Development Rights program should be explored within an area identified to focus new development and provide private sector incentives to remove problem properties

Policy 5.4: Successful revitalization of High Street will require developing clear thematic centers for marketing and identity, and connected by varying land use strategies to focus intensity of new development and business activity.

Recommendation 5.4.1: Develop activity centers that act as 'anchors' for High Street revitalization at 11th Avenue and High Street, 15th Avenue and High Street, and Lane Avenue and High Street.

Recommendation 5.4.2: Form a committee of community and City representatives to identify a limited number of sites from 5th Avenue to 9th Avenue that can accommodate larger format (5,000 to 30,000 square foot users) retailers. Priorities and incentives should be given to ensure redevelopment of current sites that have eroded the street wall or contain a series of non-contributing structures. Create specific design criteria for each site that protects adjacent residential properties, preserves the urban character and maintains the street wall of High Street while not precluding the viability of new development in these locations.

Recommendation 5.4.3: Develop a Mixed Use area that extends 425' from the centerline of High Street into the Neighborhoods from East 12th Avenue to East 16th Avenue (this is consistent with Mixed Use Area II, shown in Figure 12: Land Use Concept). Ground floor commercial uses should be permitted for up to 200 feet east of Pearl Street as a transition into the Neighborhoods. In general, commercial uses east of Pearl Street should not be allowed until:

- after the successful revitalization of High Street,
- improvements and widening to Pearl Street have been made from 12th Avenue (north side) to 15th Avenue (north side)

Recommendation 5.4.4: Explore ways to stimulate retail concentration in the identified activity centers for long term viability.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Historic Context: To understand the current issues surrounding zoning, it is important to also understand the area's zoning evolution. Zoning was first applied in 1928, when the majority of the District was already constructed. At that time, 37% of the area was zoned for high density housing at 36 dwelling units per acre. Most of this density was located in a band between Summit and Fourth Streets, which carried the trolley lines to and from downtown Columbus. Surprisingly, the current East Campus Neighborhood was zoned with the area's lowest density at 9 dwelling units per acre.

In the mid-1950s, with the rapid growth of the university and the need for additional housing, the majority of the Neighborhoods were upzoned to AR-4. The process of institutionalizing density drove up underlying land values and led to property price escalation. As homeownership became more costly, existing homes were either demolished to make way for higher density apartments or converted to rooming houses. The rapidly increasing density and lack of accompanying amenities were exacerbated by a lack of coordination between City zoning, building inspection, and permitting functions, which allowed landlords to renovate and construct properties using marginal construction practices.

Since that time, the city of Columbus has taken several actions to prevent these problems. In 1978, the permitting and zoning functions were combined in the Department of Regulation. Areas south and southeast of the campus were downzoned in 1979 and 1980 from 36 to 17.4 units per acre. This was done to reverse the rate of single-family home demolitions, and to create underlying economics that would once again allow affordable single-family homeownership. While the downzoning and departmental restructuring provided some relief, these actions failed to fully solve the community's land pricing and appearance problems, partially due to inadequate enforcement.

Due to the limited improvement afforded by these changes, the University District Overlay was introduced in 1987 to accomplish four primary objectives: (1) reduce density; (2) increase parking; (3) improve compatibility of new development; and (4) bring about environmental improvement of the area.

FAR limitations were the primary tools of the Overlay and were used to change development intensities, increase parking ratios, and to initiate design review to lessen the degree of inappropriate development.

Current Land Use: The following table summarizes the major land uses within the University District, based on the GIS analysis conducted during the initial phases of the Plan's development. The land use by acreage and percentage demonstrates the significant variances between Planning Areas:

Zoning Categories: Today, the University Neighborhoods are zoned primarily for residential and commercial uses. Currently, the predominant zoning designations in the area include C-4, AR-4, R-4, R-2F and UCRPD. In addition to these designations, other zoning categories (AR-1, C-1, M) from the City of Columbus Zoning Code apply on a limited basis. . The most relevant zones are described below going from most to least dense.

- **AR-4--Apartment Residential District:** This zoning designation provides for a variety of uses but focuses on high density apartment developments. Subdivided dwellings with three or four dwelling units are also allowed. Most of the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods and sections of Indianola Terrace, as well as small pockets immediately to the north of the study area are zoned AR-4. This is also the only residential zone that permits the Rooming House use.
- **R-4--Residential District:** This zoning allows primarily for single family dwellings with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, approximately eight dwelling units per acre. R-4 zoning also allows for the subdivision of buildings with three or four dwelling units per building. Multiple dwelling developments located on a lot of roughly one half acre or more are also permitted. Weinland Park East, Weinland Park West, Necko/Dennison Place and sections of Indianola Terrace and Iuka Ravine are zoned R-4.
- **R-2F--Residential District:** This zoning provides for single family houses on lots of 6,000 square feet or greater (approximately 7 dwelling units per acre) and two family dwellings, commonly called duplexes. Iuka Ravine and areas to the north of the study area are zoned R-2F.
- **C-4--Community Scale Commercial Development:** This zoning designation allows for a wide variety of commercial uses geared toward providing commercial services for a large community. Residential units above commercial uses are also allowed. High Street is predominantly zoned C-4.
- **LUCRPD--University-College Research Park District:** This zoning designation is designed with a broad mixture of permitted land use types and development standards tailored to meet the needs of a large educational, research complex and its surrounding environment. The majority of The Ohio State University's property is zoned under this classification.
- **M-Manufacturing:** This zoning designation permits limited manufacturing facilities and other uses permitted in commercial districts, with the exception of residential uses.

Infrastructure: The University District is fully serviced by utilities including gas, electricity, street lighting, water, telephone, and cable television. The providers of these services are:

Natural Gas:	Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.
Electricity:	American Electric Power (AEP)
Street Lighting/Electricity:	City of Columbus Electricity Division
Water:	City of Columbus Water Division
Sanitary and Storm Sewers:	City of Columbus Sewerage and Drainage Division
Telephone:	Ameritech
Cable Television:	Warner Cable

The primary area of infrastructure concern is stormwater and street lighting. As more surfaces become paved and the amount of natural and man-made retention capacity is reduced, increased flooding is imminent. Combined sanitary and storm sewers are found throughout the majority of the study area, exacerbating the stormwater capacity and storage problem. Stormwater discharge capacity is reduced in three specific areas where reinforcement sewers may be required to prevent flooding:

- Oakland Avenue from Williams Street west to Olentangy River – 36" and 42" sewers experience varying capacities due to differing pipe sizes and slopes; and
- Indianola/ Woodruff Avenue – 72" sewer; capacity is reduced due to change in pipe slope.

While combined sewers in all areas seem to have adequate sanitary sewer capacity in times of low or no storm flow, some are inadequate for current storm sewer criteria utilized by the city of Columbus. The following table illustrates the capacity problems within some neighborhoods and the need to separate stormwater and sanitary sewer or increase capacity to meet existing residential densities.

Neighborhood	Indianola Terrace	Iuka Ravine Indianola Forest	South Campus	East Campus	Weinland Park-East	Weinland Park -West
Area (Acres)	150	105	90	145	127	80
Population /Ac	29.1	31.6	37.8	41.6	17.5	28.7
Units / Ac	11.6	13.4	19.2	15.7	8.5	15.3
Sanitary Sewer Demand (cfs)	3.45	2.62	2.62	4.54	1.93	1.79
Storm Sewer Demand (cfs)	291.90	204.30	175.10	282.20	247.10	155.70
Combined Sewer Demand (cfs)	295.35	206.92	177.72	286.74	249.03	157.49
Combined Sewer Capacity (cfs)	147.60	349.70	84.80	410.20	77.70	145.00
Capacity Surplus (Deficit)	(147.75)	142.78	(92.92)	123.46	(171.33)	(12.49)

Notes:

- 1) Population data from 1990 Census.
- 2) Sewer capacity based on analysis generated by Burgess and Niple using current city of Columbus design criteria of 2-year storm frequency, average C factor of 0.7 for the area, and a 5-year storm frequency to be contained within the system.
- 3) Densities calculated are gross.

The table portrays the lack of stormwater capacity in areas such as Indianola Terrace and Weinland Park. Although reducing densities in these areas will have a limited effect on this problem (as the primary strain comes from stormwater not sanitary sewer), a reduction in high density uses and an increase in open space would help relieve some of these constraints.

D. Programs and Concepts

Downzoning: In 1979, much of the University District was downzoned to protect existing neighborhoods and limit inappropriate development. With the adoption of the second University District Overlay in 1992, the area was effectively downzoned again. While the underlying zoning classification in many areas is still R-4, the Overlay's FAR limitations effectively creates densities more consistent with the R2-F classification. The recommendation for further downzoning is meant to formalize what the Overlay has successfully started, while

at the same time increasing the desirability of these neighborhoods for new single-family ownership. The reduced zoning will assure buyers their property values will be preserved.

The University District Overlay: The University District Overlay, administered by the Development Regulation Division with design review executed by the University Area Review Board, will continue to play a valuable role in improving the University Neighborhoods. The Overlay's design standards are intended to foster appropriate design integrity of the area. While the Overlay is generally an effective tool, it could be improved in three ways:

1. **Public Information and Assistance** - Greater public information and education regarding the Overlay and its requirements should be made available. Currently, many land owners or potential developers misunderstand the roles, functions, and purposes of the Overlay. As such, a perception may exist that the Overlay is burdensome to potential new development, thereby discouraging new investment in the area. While the Overlay does impose additional requirements on development, over the long term, it will play an important role in stabilizing and preserving the Neighborhoods. This in turn will provide better returns to investors who respect the intent of the Overlay.
To communicate the merits of the Overlay, the City and Campus Partners should engage in a public education campaign. The campaign should target property owners, developers, and real estate professionals active in the area and could include fact sheets that outline the major points of the overlay, as well as simple illustrations to demonstrate development consistent with the overlay.
2. Secondly, additional technical assistance should be provided for individual property owners and neighborhood groups in developing appropriate solutions to renovation and rehabilitation problems in selected lower income areas. This service could easily be provided as an outreach program of The Ohio State University's Architecture and/or planning programs or through the Neighborhood Design Assistance Center.
3. Thirdly, the boundaries of the University Impact District put many structures most worth saving at greatest risk. Assuming that the revitalization effort is successful in reducing crime and increasing the attractiveness of the area, inappropriate development will be drawn to those areas with the least amount of review and the lowest cost property. This includes a significant portion of the Weinland Park and Indianola Terrace neighborhoods. The design review process should be expanded to at least include these critical areas, and more ideally expanded to coincide with the University District as a whole so that the integrity of the entire area is maintained.

Two tier design review - With implementation of the downzoning recommendations and new incentives for new development or rehabilitation, there may be the need for two levels of design review.

- Detailed review should occur for new infill as well as major renovations and change of use for existing development. The intent should be to ensure that investment is done in a manner consistent with the long-term vision of the Neighborhoods. The existing design review process should be adequate for this level of review.
- A simpler, more administrative review process should be provided, along with University Area Review Board assistance, for the average home-owner. The audience should be homeowners trying to upgrade their property but lacking the means for extensive renovation, professional design services, or expensive materials. The intent of this review should be to facilitate upgrading individual properties without making the review process punitive.

Finally, commercial design review should be added to the University Area Review Board's responsibilities.

Elimination of Non Permitted Land Uses: In several cases, uses at particular sites conflict with current zoning classifications. In most cases, these establishments are auto body shops or limited commercial facilities operating in residential areas. This situation clearly presents a land use conflict and degrades the character and investment potential of specific blocks.

For land uses that are clearly not permitted and have a significant negative effect on the adjoining properties, every avenue should be explored to have them removed. Options includes legal review for their removal where legal grounds exist; establishing an amortization schedule agreed-upon by the property owner and the City; outright purchase of the property using funds from the Problem Property Fund.

However, it is important to note that with the adoption of the 1979 area downzoning, and the 1987 and 1992 University District Overlay many current residential properties may be non-conforming by current standards

but are still legal and permitted as existing uses. Therefore the intent of this recommendation is to remove noxious uses that have a negative impact on surrounding properties, but should not be construed as a recommendation to force removal of residential properties that exceed current FAR limitations.

Redevelopment Incentives: The existing system of FAR bonuses for renovation could be expanded to reward property owners who assist with meeting other community goals such as increased off-street parking or recreation and open space facilities. The precise bonus to the designated Mixed Use Areas will need to be developed based on an analysis of need and contextual conditions, but the current FAR bonus of .2 (used for adaptive reuse of contributing structures) may be a good starting point.

The critical element of these bonuses would be that the amenity provided has to demonstrate lasting benefit to the neighborhood. Consequently, simply increasing the amount of open space would not qualify, but the aggregation of open space into a pocket park with recreational facilities should warrant increased FAR or variances in side and rear yard setbacks (not front setback).

Transfer of Development Rights: Another option would be to explore a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program. Under such a program, a designated Receiving Area would be defined to allow development of additional housing over and above that permitted by the Overlay or underlying zoning, as long as the additional housing was made up of 'bedrooms' bought from problem properties in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods. If properly developed and managed the program will shift some population to the designated Mixed Use areas while upgrading rental products and helping to de-densify many congested blocks. The proposed Contributing Areas (those areas from which bedrooms can be 'bought' and the proposed Receiving Areas (those areas to which bedrooms can be transferred) are shown in Figure 11: Transfer of Development Rights Area Boundaries.

Figure 11: Transfer of Development Rights Area Boundaries

To illustrate this concept, a forty bedroom 'people packer' purchased and removed along 14th Avenue would permit a developer to build an additional number of bedrooms (estimated at 50% of existing or 20 bedrooms) over and above the density permitted by the current Overlay, but only in the receiving area. The site left over from the purchased bedrooms could then be redeveloped or converted to pocket parking or open space. If the site is to be redeveloped, it can only be redeveloped to the density permitted by the existing Overlay, and the new number of bedrooms built would have to be subtracted from those transferred.

This concept will aid in the removal of problem properties by unlocking some of the economics of illegal conversions and large properties whose values are based on cash flow. This in turn could also facilitate the de-conversion of 'defacto rooming houses' back to single family houses. Concurrent with the removal of problem properties and improving the economics of changing properties back to single family, the program will help to focus new units in the designated Mixed Use areas where amenities and transit alternatives can be more cost effectively delivered.

The success of this concept is closely tied to identification of a realistic ceiling based on market demand and carrying capacity of the area.. Identifying the correct retirement ratio to reach an equilibrium of supply and demand is implicit in generating quality construction that is economically viable. Consequently, further study and recommendations will need to be developed before a TDR program could be officially adopted.

Lot Aggregation: The current Overlay limits development of products that combine several lots into one single structure. The intent of this restriction is to minimize development of large apartment type complexes that would be out of scale with the rhythmic single family structure pattern that typifies the historic evolution of the area. However, in order to allow for the development of new rental products that can provide an appropriate level of parking and open space while maintaining economic viability, the designated Mixed Use areas should allow more flexibility for creative use of multiple lots.

By combining lots, new products can be developed that are economically viable while also providing new, valuable pocket amenities such as recreational sites, open space or parking. The intent of this recommendation is to encourage more flexibility at the time of site plan review for specific projects that meet the spirit and intent of the Overlay, while demonstrating benefit to the greater community by combining several lots.

However, it is important to note that the ability to combine lots, will be specifically limited to a the very small portion of the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods designated as Mixed Use areas I and II.

Land Use Concept: Many of the previous concepts and recommendations are presented graphically in Figure 5: Land Use Concept (this is the same map displayed on page II-17, but is repeated here to assist the reader in understanding the recommendations). While the map is not intended to be a detailed land use of zoning map, it does show the limits of the designated Mixed Use areas, which are limited areas proposed to receive TDR's and allow consideration for lot aggregation. The areas would also have the highest relative level of development intensity and activity when compared with other areas of the University District.

The land use categories portrayed include:

- **Mixed Use Area 1:** An active mix of retail, office and residential uses, and the area most flexible in terms of zoning variances and site plan review. Projects would be considered on a site specific basis, and may make use of the Commercial Planned Development designation to achieve design concepts difficult to realize under existing zoning or the Overlay. Development incentives include receipt of TDR 'bedrooms' purchased from the designated Contributing Area, and lot aggregation.
- **Mixed Use Area 2:** A transitional mix of ground floor pedestrian oriented commercial uses with residential units above to connect High Street with the neighborhoods to the east. Density would be limited to the FAR requirements of the Overlay, and commercial uses would only be permitted by variance based on a project specific basis. Development incentives include a commercial 'bonus', which would allow site specific commercial uses following review, but whose total square footage would not count towards the Overlay F.A.R. calculation. Another incentive includes consideration for lot aggregation.
- **Moderate intensity residential area with minimal commercial:** Predominantly residential rental properties in either adaptively re-used contributing structures or new construction built in conformance with the existing Overlay. Limited commercial and neighborhood service providers, approved by variance on a site specific basis.
- **Lowest intensity residential area with limited corner store retail:** Predominantly single family ownership units and limited small rental properties in renovated contributing structures such as duplexes or rowhouses. Limited corner commercial or carry-out facilities dispersed throughout the neighborhoods. All products rehabilitated in conformance with the existing Overlay.
- **Neighborhood Commercial Centers:** Predominantly neighborhood and convenience commercial uses in adaptively re-used structures or new construction consistent with existing development patterns and proposed Design Guidelines.
- **Community Commercial:** Combination of community commercial as well as destination retail/entertainment, with office or limited residential uses on the upper floors. Adaptively re-use of existing structures or new construction consistent with existing development patterns and proposed Design Guidelines.

Revitalizing High Street: One of the greatest challenges and most promising opportunities for the University Neighborhoods is the revitalization of High Street. The greatest potential for this corridor is a unique commercial district serving the University District, Ohio State's student population and the city at large. Currently, the properties on High Street are not particularly attractive to the student market, nor do they provide sufficient diversity for the community. A revitalized High Street should be one of the initiating actions for the revitalization of the entire area.

The zoning of High Street should recognize the need for a variety of community-oriented commercial enterprises as well as facilities for offices, research and development, arts and entertainment, and university facilities. In addition, the zoning should foster transitions between the retail activity on High Street and the nearby residential areas. Also, land use planning and regulation should maximize the strengths of High Street and allow for concentrations of development and major activity centers.

Other recommendations and explanation of the proposed concepts for revitalization are contained in Chapter 15.0.

6.0 RESIDENTIAL REVITALIZATION

A. Objectives

One of the principal goals of the Revitalization Plan is to increase homeownership, which will require increasing the desirability of the University District as an area where people want to live. Potential residents include students, faculty and staff of The Ohio State University, retired individuals, families of all types, and individuals seeking an urban neighborhood lifestyle.

The primary focus of this chapter's policies and recommendations is to balance the development of residential options within the District, ranging from single-family homes to affordable rentals. Although a balanced supply is the long-term objective, an immediate emphasis is placed on rapidly increasing single-family homeownership in the District.

No single action of this Revitalization Plan can effect the benefits that will come from pride of homeownership. These benefits include improvements to the community's physical appearance; a broader community base for volunteer programs; stronger voter turnout; better surveillance of the streets; and economic support for neighborhood retail, school, and civic functions. These recommendations are meant to build on the City's existing homeownership programs and create more opportunities for individuals at all income levels.

However, while increased homeownership is key to improving the District, it alone will not solve the District's problems. Without improving the quality of K-12 education, reducing crime, expanding and improving public and social services, and offering more diverse retail options individuals will not seek to move back into the area regardless of how many incentives or programs are offered.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 6.1: A program of specific financial incentives for homeownership in the Neighborhoods should be created to attract a rapid build-up of new homeowners.

Recommendation 6.1.1: Work with City, State, and Federal officials to assure a portion of current homeownership assistance funds are dedicated to the University District to ensure that potential homebuyers have a guaranteed level of funding from existing programs.

Recommendation 6.1.2: The Ohio State University should consider providing a residence for the University President within the University District.

Recommendation 6.1.3: The Ohio State University should lead with a new program of specific incentives for faculty and staff homeownership in the Neighborhoods. The program should provide loan guarantees, interest subsidies, and downpayment assistance using models from other institutions around the country to bring 350 new staff and faculty homeowners into the University District by the year 2000.

Recommendation 6.1.4: Other local employers and institutions should follow Ohio State's lead and develop similar programs for employees seeking to live in the University District.

Policy 6.2: To maximize the impact of homeownership investments, incentives should be offered in tiers and focus assistance in improving neighborhoods.

Recommendation 6.2.1: Establish a basic level of information and program support for any individual wishing to purchase a home in the University District.

Recommendation 6.2.2: Focus the deepest homeownership incentives in five areas selected for the quality of their housing stock, range of prices, and immediate revitalization potential. Refer to Figure: 13: Homeownership Incentives.

- Sub-area of Indianola Terrace as defined by East 12th Avenue north to East 18th Avenue, Fourth Street to Conrail Tracks.
- Sub-area of Dennison Place as defined by King Avenue (both sides) to the alley south of Eighth Avenue between Wall Street and Highland Avenue, and the alley south of Ninth Avenue between Highland Avenue and Neil Avenue.
- Sub-area of Weinland Park West as defined by Euclid Avenue to East Ninth, from Hamlet Street to Pearl Street.
- Northwood Avenue and Oakland Avenues from Pearl Street to Indianola Avenue.
- Norwich Avenue to Patterson Avenue from Wall Alley to Tuttle Park.

Recommendation 6.2.3: As improving neighborhoods reach a level of homeownership that successfully supports their stabilization, transfer the deepest incentives to new neighborhoods within the University District that need assistance.

Policy 6.3: To effectively increase the desirability of homeownership, problem properties must be aggressively removed or rehabilitated through a combination of public and private sector initiatives

Recommendation 6.3.1: The city of Columbus and The Ohio State University should establish a Problem Property Fund to acquire and remove problem properties, targeting removal of 15 properties by the year 2000.

Recommendation 6.3.2: For single-family structures to be rehabilitated or de-converted from rooming houses, provide subsidies to ensure they can be sold at market rate to single-family homeowners after renovation. Target 120 units over five years, with a pilot program of 8 structures established in one neighborhood for 1997.

Recommendation 6.3.3: Residual sites following demolition of problem properties should be sold for new, infill single-family development. Pocket recreational facilities or parking lots may also be an acceptable use, but only if an entity can be identified to assume long term maintenance responsibilities, and only if the design of such facilities is completed in a manner that does not disrupt the integrity of the existing block faces. In some cases, where parking is considered as an interim use, design standards must still be met.

Policy 6.4: Discourage further concentrations of poverty in the University Neighborhoods, consistent with City of Columbus 1993 Housing and Neighborhood Revitalization Policies.

Recommendation 6.4.1: Monitor subsidized rental housing concentrations to ensure a distribution of units throughout the community and avoid concentrations of poverty in areas already approaching or exceeding the 30% guideline.

Recommendation 6.4.2: Work with HUD/CMHA to determine exact number of Section 8 units in given block areas, and develop strategies to transfer rental units into ownership while decreasing concentrations in accordance with City policy.

Policy 6.5: Ensure that revitalization efforts maintain a balance of market rate to affordable homeowner and rental properties within the University Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 6.5.1: Provide financial and organizational support to Columbus Housing Partnership/Northside Development Corporation for the development of 50 new affordable homeownership units.

Recommendation 6.5.2: The Ohio State University and city of Columbus, working through Campus Partners, should provide gap financing and assistance in managing the acquisition and renovation process of available properties.

Recommendation 6.5.3: The city of Columbus and Campus Partners should convene a planning team of local and national experts to address displacement, low income housing and other issues that are important issues for a balanced and broad based revitalization of the Neighborhoods.

Policy 6.6: A housing promotion and assistance entity should be established to assist potential homebuyers find properties, identify funding sources, and promote homeownership and housing options for long term renters within the University District.

Recommendation 6.6.1: Campus Partners should manage an information clearinghouse that provides accessible information on housing options and resources, with UDO taking an active role in promoting homeownership in the Neighborhoods through a consolidated marketing strategy.

Recommendation 6.6.2: The clearinghouse should provide information for potential homebuyers as well as options for long term or new renters that might become homeowners. This might be as simple as providing a list of immediately available non-student rental properties, to working with Ohio State University to offer incentives for young faculty that may be willing to live in the East, North and South Campus neighborhoods.

Recommendation 6.6.3: The real estate and banking communities should take an active role assisting qualified individuals and structuring financial assistance from existing programs.

Recommendation 6.6.4: Campus Partners should convene a Committee of Housing Providers consisting of lenders, Columbus Neighborhood Development Division, Northside Development Corporation (NDC), Columbus Housing Partnership (CHP), Ohio State, realtors, landlords (such as Broad Street Management), and builders active in the area to review these recommendations, to decide how the programs can best be implemented, and to determine what resources each stakeholder can bring to assist in the revitalization of the Neighborhoods.

Policy 6.7: Historic and contributing residential structures provide a valuable resource for creating unique and positive identity in the University District's neighborhoods.

Recommendation 6.7.1: Future homeownership programs should emphasize the valuable nature of the Neighborhoods' four designated Historic Districts as unique places to live, and utilize them to anchor the Neighborhoods' residential revitalization effort.

Recommendation 6.7.2: New residential development should be designed to reflect its context, including but not limited to; attention to setbacks, building materials, massing and building orientation relative to the streetfront. In designated Mixed Use areas design patterns and building materials should be responsive to context, but flexibility in design should be permitted for solutions that are consistent with the spirit and intent of the surrounding area but do not literally replicate existing design patterns.

Policy 6.8 Upgrade the competitive position of the East, North and South and Campus Neighborhoods as a rental housing location for graduate and undergraduate students.

Recommendation 6.8.1: A District level plan should be prepared for the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods based on a thorough inventory of existing conditions. The plan should guide problem property designation, development of offstreet parking options, and potential locations and phasing for pocket recreation facility development.

Recommendation 6.8.2: Set a goal of 400 improved rental units (rehabilitation and new construction) within the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods by the year 2000, that offer a level of quality above what is currently available, and focusing on markets not currently served.

Recommendation 6.8.3: The Ohio State University should engage in the active upgrading of existing student rental properties while maintaining affordability, either working with existing landlords to improve the quality of their properties, or directly developing improved products through the university's housing office. This may include acquisition and adaptive re-use of marginal small properties and rooming houses.

Recommendation 6.8.4 : Property owners and the Columbus Apartment Association, with the assistance of the city of Columbus and Campus Partners, should create a Property Owners Association for the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods to provide levels of security, litter removal, front yard maintenance, parking, and open space development commensurate with the density and character of the area.

Recommendation 6.8.5.: The Property Owners Association, in conjunction with Ohio State and the Columbus Apartment Association, should develop a communication and training program for small landlords to upgrade the quality and management of existing rental units in the Neighborhoods.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Homeownership: The level of homeownership in the University Neighborhoods has dropped dramatically over the past four decades. As of the 1990 Census, fewer than 6% of the 11,000 housing units in the University Neighborhoods were owner-occupied. The rate increases slightly to 11% if the area immediately north of the study area is included.

Some portions of the Neighborhoods, particularly the NECKO/Dennison Place and Iuka Ravine neighborhoods, have relatively high homeownership rates and would be even more attractive to potential buyers if incentive programs were in place. In other portions of the Neighborhoods, ownership rates are lower and housing conditions are poorer; in these areas it will be necessary to combine homeownership incentives with actual housing rehabilitation and/or new construction if significant increases in ownership levels is to take place.

Student Housing: The competitive advantage of the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods provided by their proximity to Ohio State has steadily eroded over the past 20 years. A holistic approach to improving the physical and operational characteristics is necessary to maximize the area's locational advantage. (See Chapter 9.0 for other recommendations for areas beyond housing to improve the student experience).

The most evident problems related to student housing in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods is the poor environmental conditions (crime, trash graffiti) and the lack of amenities within the area's housing stock. The products and services offered by rental properties in competitive communities are considered superior on almost every level by the student renter. This issue must be addressed if the Neighborhoods and the condition of their rental market are to be improved.

Subsidized Housing: There are currently 1,175 subsidized housing units within the Neighborhoods, all part of the Federal Section 8 program. While 75 of these units are voucher-based (allowing recipients to locate where they can find appropriate housing for the available subsidy), the remaining 1,100 units are project-based or fixed in a specific location. This is both an asset and a concern as the majority of these units are concentrated in one part of the Neighborhoods—the southeast corner of the Weinland Park Neighborhood. In December 1993, the city of Columbus adopted the "Housing and Neighborhood Revitalization Policies" which committed the City to mitigating the impacts of poverty and avoiding further concentrations in central City neighborhoods. This was to be accomplished by not supporting new housing projects designed to attract additional very low income residents in neighborhoods at or exceeding poverty rates of 30%.

Market Potential and Revitalization Opportunities

Several neighborhoods within the study area provide an important combination of proximity to the university, affordable housing stock, and a current upward improvement in neighborhood character. A proposed program of homeowner incentives will create an infusion of new homeowners to rapidly advance these neighborhoods toward revitalization. Over time these incentives may be sponsored by a wide number of private and public sector agencies and employers to encompass the majority of the Neighborhoods. However, in its initial phases, the program must be targeted to three or four key areas to create critical mass and be predominantly led by Ohio State for its faculty and staff.

Market Potential – Faculty and Staff Ownership Housing: To achieve greater homeownership many programs must be implemented concurrently. However, the process of revitalization can be greatly accelerated with minimum investment by Ohio State for incentives to faculty and staff to live in the Neighborhoods. Currently, only 3.8% of faculty and staff live in the University District. Despite this fact, research conducted by the Campus Partners planning team revealed a potential of 330-390 units that would be purchased by faculty and staff in the University Neighborhoods, provided the right incentives are offered. Furthermore, successful

programs at other similar institutions indicate that as the program catches on and the Neighborhoods improve, faculty and staff turnover will generate more demand for units from all sectors of the population.

Research indicates a preference for three-bedroom units in single-family detached or attached configurations, with parking the most desired amenity. One-fourth to 40% of the respondents to a faculty/staff housing survey would also pay extra for a playground, pool, and child care facility. Most respondents would accept either renovated or new units, although more would prefer renovation.

To achieve this demand, an organized rehabilitation and infill process will be necessary. Purchase (and to some extent rent with option to purchase) will be the most popular, and ownership should be encouraged for the sake of greater benefit to the neighborhood. Many of the interested faculty and staff could afford to buy without financial assistance, but an incentive program will be necessary to ensure a house purchase in the Neighborhoods as opposed to other locations. This is important to create the critical mass of faculty and staff within the University Neighborhoods.

Market Potential - Rental Apartments: The Neighborhoods' share of The Ohio State University's declining student population has also decreased from approximately 13,000 student residents in 1989 to 11,000 student residents in 1994.

This decline is largely attributable to competition from suburban developments increasingly popular among students. Analysis indicates that off-campus students consider housing outside of the Neighborhoods superior in almost every dimension: security, outdoor lighting, deadbolts and window locks, lack of roaches, general look and condition, insulation, quiet, speed and completeness of repairs, and ease of contacting the landlord. Although there are some managers of apartments in the Neighborhoods whose units rate higher than the average of all managers in the Neighborhoods, *no major Neighborhood manager rates close to the average rating for other areas.*

This leads to the conclusion that demand exists from both students and others for higher quality rental apartments that would offer the quality, service levels, and ambiance of the better suburban complexes, factors which are more important than specific amenities such as jacuzzis and party decks. There is demand in the East, South and North Campus Neighborhoods for approximately 850-900 units over the next five years if major service and physical improvements can be effected in the neighborhood. Some of this demand should be met through new construction however, most of the demand will be met through renovation. The emphasis should be on graduate student housing until neighborhood improvements generate an increase in the area's capture rate of undergraduates relative to more suburban areas. Long waiting lists for housing for couples and families with children at Buckeye Village also indicate significant potential for approximately 200 more new units of family student housing.

The market is also strong enough to justify the upgrading of existing rental properties in the East, South and North Campus Neighborhoods. However, some owners will not undertake such improvements voluntarily even if they would be economically rational. Consequently, certain rental properties are so blighted that they have particularly harmful effects on the blocks surrounding them. These will need to be acquired and either rehabilitated for student or non-student use, or replaced with a more appropriate infill use.

D. Programs and Concepts

Homeownership Assistance: There are many existing programs that address the barriers to homeownership. There is downpayment assistance through State and Federal programs as well as through local lenders, assistance with monthly payments through Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) and Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) programs, and acquisition/rehabilitation assistance (including cases in which the appraised value of the home is less than acquisition and rehabilitation costs) through Federal programs and local lender products. These programs can be utilized in almost any combination (with the primary exception that a homeowner may not use both the MCC and MRB programs). *The limitations to many of these programs is that funding is small and used up very quickly. To increase homeownership in the Neighborhoods, the existing programs need to be supplemented with additional funding, particularly to address loan-to-value issues.*

Staff and Faculty Program: For faculty and staff interested in moving to the University District, the most important actions that would affect their decision are reducing crime and renovating existing housing stock. Also of importance are improving public services, reducing student rowdiness, removing problem bars, and improving public schools.

Some of the interested staff and faculty could afford to buy without financial assistance, but will not consider the University District, without some form of incentive. For many others financial assistance will be necessary to ensure homeownership. Most importantly, financial incentives will be necessary to draw a critical mass of staff and faculty to those parts of the University District on the cusp of improvement. Consequently, staff and faculty programs should be offered throughout, the entire University District, but with more generous incentives in priority target areas. Specific programs include:

- **Mortgage Guarantees:** Given the affordable nature of housing in Columbus in general and the University District in particular, mortgage guarantees may be the most useful mechanism. Under the Revitalization Plan's recommendation, Ohio State would provide 100 to 105% mortgage guarantees for employees who purchase homes anywhere in the University District. The mortgage guarantee makes obtaining a mortgage possible for employees who might not otherwise be able to do so due to income levels or past credit problems. The program would be especially helpful to those who lack downpayment funds. Based on similar programs at other institutions, the potential losses should be low, particularly since mortgage payments could be made through payroll deductions. Such a program has been in place at the University of Pennsylvania for 30 years with virtually no defaults.
- **Downpayment Assistance:** Ohio State, in partnership with existing Federal, State, local, and private banking programs should offer downpayment assistance (e.g., \$2,500 per unit) for purchase of homes in targeted areas, with the City or State committing to downpayment assistance for one-half of the units.
- **Interest Rate Subsidy:** Reduced interest rates should also be available in the target areas, with the State making available tax exempt bond financing or mortgage credit certificates for one-half of the targeted 350 units and Ohio State providing interest rate buydowns (e.g., an interest rate reduction of three points in the first year, two points in the second year, and one point in the third year) for the other units.
- **Gap Financing:** Gap financing, particularly "silent second mortgages" that are repayable only to the extent that homes appreciate over time should be the last tier of incentive. This program can be used to address the problem of appraised values being lower than total acquisition and development costs in the early years of the program. If a home appreciates sufficiently, the assistance would be a true loan. To the extent the home does not appreciate, the assistance would, in effect, be a grant. The HUD 203(k) program, which allows mortgages of up to 110% of the expected market value (with additional flexibility possible in redevelopment areas), can also help to address this issue.

Property Rehabilitation Program: To achieve the demand for ownership housing forecasted above, and to revitalize the target areas, an organized rehabilitation and infill construction process will be necessary. In addition to providing political and organizational support as well as gap financing for CHP/NDC, Campus Partners using private contractors will need to take an active role in acquiring and rehabilitating selected single-family properties to "prime the pump" and show prospective homebuyers it can be done. Homes that undergo this type of renovation would be made available to any prospective resident and not limited to Ohio State faculty and staff. Construction capital for acquisition and renovation will need to be initially established through a partnership of Ohio State, the city of Columbus, and the banking community, with the proceeds from the sale of each renovated property replenishing a portion of the rehabilitation fund. However, given the potential cost of acquisition of each unit, the cost for renovation, and the cost to bring to market, an estimated \$15,000 subsidy will be required per unit. Consequently, to rehabilitate a target of 120 units over 5 years could require \$1,800,000 in subsidy.

Affordable Housing Program: Many residents of the Neighborhoods, especially in locations such as Weinland Park, share the same concerns as other residents but want to be able to continue to live in the community after the recommended improvements are achieved. Columbus Housing Partnership (CHP) and Northside Development Corporation (NDC) need to be made partners in any focused residential revitalization program to develop affordable homeownership opportunities for area residents. These opportunities need to be created concurrently with incentive programs developed for Ohio State faculty and staff.

Columbus Housing Partnership and Northside Development Corporation already have experience with rehabilitation projects and associated financing in the Neighborhoods and are ideally positioned to provide the requested services, with Campus Partners offering a reasonable level of financial support for a pilot program. CHP/NDC could manage the properties during rehabilitation and the time it takes to sell the property, arrange or provide financing, and market the program to prospective buyers. If possible, the agreement between Campus Partners and CHP/NDC should be structured so that CHP/NDC has an incentive to keep the subsidy per unit to a minimum, thereby increasing the total number of units assisted. There will be ample units and sites to serve both existing residents willing and able to participate as well as newcomers such as Ohio State staff. In addition, the Neighborhoods will continue to have a significant number of rental units, including halves of some owner-occupied duplexes. For example, if 500 additional homeownership units were created during the next five years, including 450 rehabilitated units and 50 new construction units, the owner-occupancy rate in the study area would increase to approximately **10%**. Even given the number of homeownership opportunities, the vast majority of the units would continue to be available for rent.

Housing Stabilization:

If the Plan is successful in achieving its goals, improved economic conditions may result in higher property values in the University Neighborhoods. Such improvements should benefit both current and new residents in the community but should not create new hardships for existing low income residents.

Housing stabilization is a goal of the Plan. The objective is to avoid displacement, including displacement of low income persons, whenever possible. If and when displacement does occur, it should be minimized as much as possible.

The important and complex human and financial issues related to displacement continue to be under discussion. A number of resources exist to address these issues in addition to those identified below (see pp. II-3 and II-4):

- Section 8 (public) housing units are a community available to help mitigate displacement. With leadership in management and a comprehensive partnership with residents which includes education, University District Section 8 units can become a model for other communities;
- Residents, community and neighborhood organizations and agencies are committed to their community and to its improvement;
- An impressive array of human service providers is already in place in the District;
- The expertise of university faculty is available from a number of departments in areas such as urban research, housing, and the human services. Their participation is facilitated through the Campus Collaborative; and
- Other cities have addressed the issue of housing displacement constructively and successfully in their redevelopment plans. Residents in West Philadelphia and Denver achieved improved circumstances as a result of careful and comprehensive planning for housing displacement. Revitalization efforts in these cities have also been more successful and viewed more positively by the community because displacement was addressed directly and constructively.

An issue related to stabilization is upgrading of current subsidized housing properties. It is not the intent of the plan to reduce the number of units in the University Neighborhoods, but in some instances reduce the concentration. It is also important that subsidized units be improved in quality.

Additionally, agencies responsible for reviewing and approving subsidized properties need to be more rigorous in their review and citing of violations. It would also be beneficial if violations cited through an improved code enforcement process (see Chapter 4.0) would be copied to CMHA and other agencies responsible for monitoring the quality and use of subsidized housing.

In order to address displacement, low income housing and other related issues, a small planning team of local and national experts will be convened by the City of Columbus and Campus Partners to define and develop a program. Their work will be concluded and their recommendations added to the Revitalization Concept no later than September 1, 1996. The team will consist of one representative each from (1) a property management

company with significant Section 8 holdings in the University District, (2) an agency which provides social and advocacy services for Section 8 residents in the University District, (3) the city of Columbus, (4) The Ohio State University/ Campus Partners, and (5) a national public housing agency such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Problem Property Fund: To successfully improve target areas, it will be necessary to aggressively remove a limited number of problem properties from all parts of the Neighborhoods, but predominantly the East Campus Neighborhood. A combination of disinvestment, lack of market demand and mismanagement has led to an increase in the number of transient, undesirable tenants Problem properties, for the purpose of this plan can be defined as having on or several of the following attributes:

- Suffers from excessive disinvestment and chronic code violations
- Has been the site of continued illegal activity and as such has had a negative impact on the quality of life and value of surrounding properties
- Presents a significant health hazard to its occupants, neighbors and the community at large.

The recommendations propose that the City and The Ohio State University work together to accomplish acquisition and elimination of at least 15 problem properties over the next five years. While acquisition will most likely be at market rates, purchase prices should be adjusted for severe code deficiencies that may not be reflected by a pure income based appraisal. Although subject to competition from other projects, application could be made to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and to HUD's Office of University Partnerships to obtain funding for such efforts.

Following acquisition, the properties should be evaluated for adaptive reuse of the structure and/or the site. Options for reuse of the structure/ site include: conversion to single family or duplex housing; smaller scale, less dense rental residential or community facilities. If demolition of the structure is warranted (due to non-contributing status of the building, severe code violations or density) options for residual site use include open space, pocket parking lots or community recreation facilities. However, if demolition of the structure is the most appropriate action, ownership and long term maintenance of the residual site must be defined prior to demolition. It is also critical that the design of any new facility (structure or site based development) respond to the existing fabric of the blockade, and provide appropriate landscape setbacks and screen walls to continue the pattern and front yard street plane of that block.

If the property to be removed is located in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods, pocket facility development should be carefully explored, with long term ownership and maintenance of the site going to the proposed Property Owner's Association. If the problem property is located in any other neighborhood, and can not be adaptively re-used, the residual site should be sold for infill residential development at a density appropriate to the block.

Homeowner Information Clearinghouse: Campus Partners in conjunction with UDO should develop a central information base on housing and housing programs which might include both ownership and rental options. As a part of this function, they should work with Ohio State to help define the faculty and staff housing program, market it to prospects, assist them in understanding the incentive package, and help them identify appropriate neighborhoods, available properties, brokers, and lending programs.

An on-line computer system would be essential in providing clearinghouse services. The system would not only provide information on the programs, but also allow prospects to enter personal financial information and housing preferences. Based on this information, the prospects can learn how much home they can afford under the various lending programs as well as potential neighborhoods or even individual homes or rental units that fit their criteria.

Personal service is also important, particularly for those who are uncomfortable with use of computers and for those who may be in need of credit counseling to help position them to become homebuyers. It may be possible to staff the clearinghouse using partial support from real estate brokers and lenders. Such professionals are already well-versed in the area and available programs and would likely cooperate in exchange for the prospect of commissions or to meet CRA guidelines. In addition to staffing, it may be possible to use the purchasing power of Ohio State and other clearinghouse users to negotiate discounts in commissions and lending fees to assist in addressing downpayment issues.

Improving the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods: Ideally, it would be possible to create a blend of all types of housing in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods, which are predominantly undergraduate students. However, it is very difficult to encourage graduate and professional students to live in the Neighborhoods, let alone expect them to live in the middle of a very heavy undergraduate concentration where priorities and objectives for the school experience are quite different. The Plan does not recommend a segregation of populations, but instead seeks to create a gradient of resident types and density.

Analysis for the Revitalization Plan, based on consumer and quantitative research, indicates demand for units of a higher quality than currently available in the Neighborhoods. In the early years of the revitalization process, units should be provided specifically for graduate and professional students because they are largely underserved in the Neighborhoods. As the Neighborhoods improve, analysis indicates that there will be sufficient demand to improve the market for additional undergraduate units and support higher quality new units as well, but these should not be developed while the undergraduate market continues to be weak in the Neighborhoods. As the overall objective of the Plan is to improve the quality of life for all residents, a balanced emphasis must be placed on the quality of life for students as well as full time residents. This means not only improving the environmental conditions of the neighborhoods (cleanliness, safety, convenience and services, etc.) but also the quality of their living options. In the early years of the revitalization process, emphasis should be placed on creating a variety of upgraded housing options for students of all levels, specifically for graduate and professional students because they are largely underserved in the Neighborhoods. If the private sector is unable to upgrade the quality of housing options for students, The Ohio State University may need to take a more proactive role in facilitating development of new products through such actions as:

- Acquisition of struggling properties and subsequent repositioning and management through the Ohio State housing office, as an alternative form of student housing.
- Acquisition of problem properties and removal of the structures. For the residual site, work with the private sector development community to and create ground leases that provide economic viability for new construction, but with covenants and restrictions to assure that a higher quality product and management is attained.
- Acquisition of problem properties, or use of surplus Ohio State property to actively develop new housing products that provide a balance of quality and affordability not currently available within the Neighborhoods.

The ultimate goal should seek to maintain the existing student population, while recapturing some of the 2,000+ students lost to other areas such as Bethel Road.

Baseline Survey: Some of the Revitalization Plan's other recommendations involve a systematic approach to documenting the existing conditions of the properties in the University Neighborhoods. Nowhere is this more important than the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods. As the first step, a rigorous inventory needs to be conducted of existing properties for code compliance and to update the city's 1991 study meant to establish an indication of total potential occupancy. The analysis will also help to define a long-term revitalization strategy for the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods regarding which properties should be retired or redeveloped, and help to establish a potential ceiling of units that will reflect effective market demand. At the same time, a baseline of current rental rates could be established as the foundation for future rent-tracking and affordability indexes.

Property Owners Association: Another critical initiative is the implementation of a Property Owner's Association. The Association, consisting of all landowners in designated parts of the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods, could manage long-term residential improvements. Specific responsibilities could include providing collective maintenance to the front yards, tree lawns, street trees, lights, and alleys, as well as a coordinated litter collection, events programming, marketing, property management training and collective buying of services. Similar to the High Street Special Improvement District (see Chapter 15.0), Ohio State students and faculty in business, planning, and architecture should partner with the Association to provide training and support to landowners seeking to improve both their properties and operations. Assessment and organizational structure needs to reflect current Ohio enabling legislation.

Preliminary discussions with major property owners have indicated that this recommendation has an immediate level of support. In order to be effective and successful from the beginning, it is recommended that a pilot area be developed, which may be smaller than the ultimate intended area. Once the Property Owner's Association is operating smoothly, new areas can be brought into the program on either a voluntary or mandatory basis.

However, in order to achieve initial success, and substantiate the value of this proposal, the most troubled areas need to be included as a part of the initial pilot project. Figure 14, Special Improvement Districts and Participation Areas, identifies the planning team's recommended limits for the initial pilot area (in which membership would be mandatory under Ohio's Special Improvement District legislation, and areas that could be added in the future either on a voluntary basis or through expansion of the mandatory requirements.

7.0 HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

A. Objectives

Education in health and healthy living are essential components in the educational landscape of the University District. Faculty teaching and research are key elements for education in health and healthy living. A community-wide approach to education in health and healthy living for schools and community institutions and organizations will strengthen the well-being of residents. Information will be offered about life style and decision-making with health consequences as well as information about available health services through private practitioners, local clinics, and the major medical centers at The Ohio State University and throughout the City. This approach establishes a standard for other university communities for education in health and healthy living.

The following objectives address community health and well being:

Objective 1: Achieve and sustain an acceptable level of health services among all residents in University Neighborhoods.

Objective 2: Provide a safe and supportive environment for young women with children who would like to pursue higher education.

Objective 3: Extend, enhance, and sustain community partnerships.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 7.1: All university area residents should have access to community-based health promotion information and health care services developed in conjunction with the University Medical Center as a health profession education program.

Recommendation 7.1.1: Plan a Collaborative Neighborhood Healthy Community Initiative in the University Neighborhoods.

Policy 7.2: A supportive environment shall be available to individuals with unique challenges and living in the University District who would like to pursue or continue higher education.

Recommendation 7.2.1: Plan and establish a Women Students and Children's Transitional Housing facility located in the University Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 7.2.2: Physical improvements made within the University District should strive to achieve optimum accessibility for disabled individuals, consistent with current national standards.

Recommendation 7.2.3: Increase the availability of both short and long term day care throughout the University District.

C. Setting and Current Issues

The Ohio State University is a major medical center providing all levels of care and preparing health professionals for service to the community. Research in the university area suggests the need among a significant portion of the residents for greater access to health promotion information and health care professionals.

There are an increasing number of young women with children who are unable to begin or continue to achieve their educational goals because they are single parents. Many of these women are already students at the university when they become pregnant, and they would like to continue their degree work. Lack of adequate child care as well as emotional and economic support are significant barriers which could be overcome through providing a community living opportunity.

A forum is needed for continued assessment of community strengths, capacities, and gifts as well as for planning, goal setting and accountability. Such a forum would provide opportunities to support development activities by all parties as they seek external dollars and opportunities to learn about (and from) each other.

D. Programs and Concepts

Healthy Community Initiative: The University District Collaborative Neighborhood Healthy Community Initiative will strengthen children, youth, families, and single and older adults within the University District by providing a community-based, integrated approach to education, employment, health and healthy living, recreation, and human services. This initiative will provide an opportunity to coordinate a number of activities and services already available in the District Neighborhoods community with new services focusing on a range of options to enhance the health and well-being of all residents. It will establish a comprehensive system for accessing these services including a single point of entry whether one wishes to make use of educational and recreational facilities or health and social services.

The initiative will include studying the need and feasibility for a "Center" which would be developed around the concept of a "Community Mall." If adopted, the Center would be designed to appeal to users of all economic and cultural backgrounds. Appropriate health-oriented businesses unique to the City would draw from outside the University District. The recreational, exercise, and nutrition businesses would draw area residents, students, and university employees. The Center would provide information, education, prevention, assessment, and referral for the full range of human service opportunities, including all types of health care. A standardized, one-stop, intake and assessment mechanism would be developed. Some direct treatment would be provided on site, but most would occur through partnerships with existing agencies. The center would serve as a training site for interprofessional collaboration in the delivery of a comprehensive, holistic approach to the social, health, education, and employment needs of residents.

The initiative will have a strong community outreach component to encourage residents to seek out the opportunities and services available throughout the community. The outreach effort will extend the services and programs to existing partner centers in other neighborhoods, maximizing use of existing facilities and resources both in the University District and the larger community. The initiative's outreach program will be coordinated with community policing efforts to have maximum impact on the safety and law enforcement issues in the Neighborhoods.

Services available through the initiative may include:

- Coordinated intake of new clients and an assessment of their needs, including a single point of entry and human services information center with computerized data accessed by a trained staff person.
- Mental health and counseling, family process and parenting.
- Educational counseling and tutoring, reading and GED referral.
- Job/career counseling and encouraging entrepreneurship by local citizens.
- Substance abuse education and treatment for all ages with special attention to the needs of youth. A major outreach effort among youth and young adults would be included with some day-treatment services and developed in conjunction with Maryhaven's new outreach program.
- Health education, prevention, promotion, screening, and referral including dental and eye care.

- Child care facilities.
- Multi-cultural arts with art development activities to attract children and adults.
- Exercise club with access to alternative medicine and treatment.
- Farmers market, cottage industry, organic gardening, recycling, and recycled products center.
- Peace school projects.
- Services for senior citizens.
- Volunteer and "neighbor-to-neighbor" emphasis.
- Emergency services - food, clothing, shelter.

The initiative will also increase teaching, learning, and inquiry opportunities for faculty and students. A healthier, well-balanced University District will result from this initiative. Interaction will increase among diverse members of the community and those who use complex human services will have a simplified point of entry to the system. Additional community-based clinical education sites will be developed in many fields, and there will be increased participation by faculty and students in the life of the community.

Women Students And Children's Transitional Housing Facility: In consultation with the Off-Campus Student Services Office, a Women Students and Children's Transitional Housing 25-unit facility will be developed. This facility will house women who are attending college (both at Ohio State and other Columbus area schools), or whose plans to attend college were interrupted by pregnancy. The program will focus on women who are or would be attending college on need-based subsidies. Planned housing will have both private and communal living spaces and include programming to build child care support and parenting skills for mothers. Planning will be based on models which include child care facilities and other services which generate funds and job or training opportunities for single mothers. Commercial space will also be included with residences above. The site and program will provide rewards for the investment based on the desirability of the single-mother population as well as test work-study activities for mothers and provide internships for students. Paid employees will be residents wherever possible.

The facility will house in private living quarters 20 to 25 women in post-high school educational programs who have children under age 10. The women will have shared cooking, recreational, and laundry spaces; access to site-based child care including parent education and job screening/training opportunities; and access to site-based latch-key programs for residents and other low-income families. The program will include internship training opportunities for students and other teaching, learning, and research opportunities for faculty and graduate students.

Women who would otherwise not have an opportunity to attend or continue their university education will benefit along with their children. The community and businesses will have an opportunity to engage and assist a low risk population that is highly motivated to complete their education and achieve economic self sufficiency. University faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities to teach and learn about this increasing population group in our society.

The program will provide low-income housing and support services for a closely defined population. It will create additional employment opportunities in the University District and provide day-care housing for women who are students. It will create educational internships and experiences for students, and teaching and research opportunities for faculty.

8.0 EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A. Objectives

Revitalization of the University District includes addressing the employment and economic needs of area residents and employers. Faculty teaching and inquiry combined with university outreach provide critical resources to strengthen the economic environment of the university area. Economic self-sufficiency for area residents is an attainable goal. Educational systems of the community will prepare residents to respond to the employment opportunities available in the area and throughout the City. Employment skills and attitudes are a

part of the curriculum of the community. Education for healthy life styles will contribute substantially to the employability of residents. Education of local employers will create a climate in which area residents are sought for their skills and attitudes as well as their proximity to local jobs. Equally important, residents will learn about opportunities for assisting neighbors who are in financial or other distress, thus strengthening the community fabric. Linking key educational and economic elements to strengthen the community offers a paradigm for other university communities for achieving economic well-being.

The central objective to achieve with respect to employment and economic development is:

Objective 1: Assist University District residents to achieve greater economic self-sufficiency.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 8.1: There should be local programs to prepare University District residents for employment.

Recommendation 8.1.1: Plan and establish a Comprehensive Employment Program for residents in the University Districts.

Policy 8.2: Support University District residents in entrepreneurial endeavors.

Recommendation 8.2.1: Develop a Business Incubator in the University Neighborhoods.

Policy 8.2.2. Support retention of existing and creation of new locally owned businesses in the High Street Corridor.

Policy 8.3: Encourage local employers to hire area residents when they have candidates with qualifications equivalent to candidates from the outside area..

Recommendation 8.3.1: Develop mechanisms to advocate employment of University District residents by local employers.

Policy 8.4: Revitalized commercial and retail efforts should provide an expanded job base for University District residents.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Achieving economic stability is a major goal of the Revitalization Plan. Low income local residents with little or no employment history need special assistance in achieving economic self-sufficiency. The Plan directly addresses this issue, drawing on all the resources within the University District to enrich its educational environment.. Residents will have access to these resources and participate in and through them..

D. Programs and Concepts

Comprehensive Employment Program: Developed in conjunction with the Godman Guild Association, other local agencies and Ohio State University Extension, the Comprehensive Employment Program (CEP) will serve residents of the University District. The program will have two distinct but interdependent components, Job Development and Employment Readiness programs, with special emphasis on substance use and abuse education.

The Job Development program will provide additional job openings targeted through the Columbus Employment Consortium. The program will explore alternative means of transportation to permit neighborhood residents access to employers distant from the campus area.

The Employment Readiness Program will provide career counseling and job skills assessment in conjunction with community agencies. Those in need of job skills for known job openings will be referred to training programs. An additional component of the program will assist with work attitudes development. Family counseling through existing community agencies will assist with family support for transition to work.

Substance abuse intervention and counseling will be provided through existing programs for those in need of such assistance.

District residents would benefit from increased preparation to enter the work force and stability achieved through economic self-sufficiency. University faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities to study and understand employment readiness development. Local businesses, including the university, would have an increased pool of employable local resident. Employment levels in the University District will increase. A greater number of area residents will be employed locally.

Youth job readiness training and job referral, as well as, additional activities for youth, such as 4-H, would be expandable in conjunction with local schools agencies, organizations and houses of worship.

Local Employment Advocacy: Through the Comprehensive Employment Program, a network of campus area employers will be developed. The network will include Ohio State where a local employment advocate will be identified. Participating employers will agree to consider hiring University District residents. Partnerships will be established to include the Franklin County JOBS program ("Work to Learn to Work") and the city of Columbus. The program will be established to take advantage of the Enterprise Zone Subsidized Employment Program (EZ-SEP), the Franklin County SEP, and the Franklin County Work Experience Program (CWEP) which provided financial and other incentives to employers to hire low-income persons.

Neighborhood residents will benefit from enhanced local employment opportunities. Families would be supported by eliminating lengthy job commutes and minimizing transportation costs and requirements. University faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities to study and understand local employment patterns and the development of local employment opportunities. Local businesses, including the university and Medical Center, will have a larger pool of employable local residents.

Employment levels in the University District will increase, and a greater number of area residents will be employed locally. Increased employment of area residents will improve incomes and overall economic well-being of area residents which will lead to more home ownership and stability in the campus area. Apprenticeship programs can be established on campus for area young people. A set-aside work-study program for community residents may be developed. Computer terminals and other sources of information about job opportunities may be located at strategic places in the community as well as on campus. Coordination between employment opportunities at the university and Medical Center and the Columbus Employment Consortium will be explored.

Business Incubator: In partnership with the Weinland Park Collaboration and other local organizations a Business Incubator will assist in the development of new businesses in the University District. The Business Incubator will rent office and/or production space for new businesses, provide technical assistance and start-up services such as business plans. Operating support services such as reception and office equipment, and business education opportunities such as management development workshops might also be provided.

University District residents will have more opportunities to achieve economic self-sufficiency and independence. Local economies will be strengthened through additional business opportunities. University faculty and graduate students will have additional opportunities to facilitate and study community-based small business development.

The Business Incubator program will encourage area residents to develop their entrepreneurial potential. Many of the small businesses developed through the program, such as home repair firms will employ area residents, do their business in the University District, and stimulate additional economic activity. Building and construction businesses could provide service in housing redevelopment efforts.. The program will contribute to the Ohio State Minority Business Development program as a resource for promoting and enhancing minority businesses in the university area. Employment levels in the University District will increase and an increasing number of area residents will be employed locally.

9.0 STUDENT QUALITY OF LIFE

A. Objectives

Students living in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods area are an important resource for creating University and engages them in the community. Participation in the life of the community through community-based learning, research, and inquiry, as well as enhanced volunteer opportunities will help them develop their sense of responsibility to the community. Additional activities and services in the community will provide students greater access and increase their effectiveness. Special attention to the abuse of alcohol and other drugs, both on and off campus, will provide an improved learning environment while students are engaged at the university, as well as enhance the quality of life of residents, visitors, and faculty.

The following objectives form the basis for policies and recommendations to improve the student quality of life:

Objective 1: Increase students' sense of responsibility for the University Neighborhoods in which they are residents.

Objective 2: Increase the desirability of the University Neighborhoods as a location for students to live by ensuring they have access to well-managed, affordable, clean, and safe off-campus housing.

Objective 3: Decrease dependence on alcohol and other drugs and provide access to treatment where needed.

Objective 4: Provide student services within the Neighborhoods with the highest density of student residents.

Objective 5: Provide an increased range of activities for students both on campus and in the University Neighborhoods.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 9.1: A full range of student services should be delivered by the university in a comprehensive Student Services Center as close as possible to where students live.

Recommendation 9.1.1: Establish in the East Campus Neighborhood a Student Services Center in consultation with the Off-Campus Student Services Office to provide a community-based, integrated approach to the housing, health promotion and education, counseling, social service, and academic learning requirements of students living in the area.

Policy 9.2:

- ***Community service opportunities in the University Neighborhoods should be linked to the academic programs of students through both action and reflection and be made widely available to students by the university.***
- ***An increased pool of persons seeking opportunities to fulfill community service requirements should not become an administrative burden for the agencies, schools, businesses, and organizations in the University District.***
- ***Persons engaging in community service should receive training for their tasks.***
- ***To serve as a model for students, as well as to fulfill the mission of the university as a land grant institution, service activities should be fully integrated into the institutional lives of all faculty and staff as well as students.***

Recommendation 9.2.1: Expand and develop opportunities for all university students, faculty, and staff to participate in community service, especially in the University District. Community service will be linked to students' academic programs, including graduation requirements, wherever feasible. The university will support activities for developing and administering community service/learning, training students and others prior to

service, and assessing the impact of service on the community and students. The university will also provide incentives to encourage faculty and non-classified staff to engage in community service in conjunction with their employment.

Policy 9.3: The university should provide a wide range of high quality social, educational, recreational, cultural, and entertainment alternatives for students. These activities should be widely dispersed throughout the campus and the community at a variety of times and locations, and be funded consistent with practices at comparable institutions.

Recommendation 9.3.1: Increase university funding for student activities and implement a diverse program of student activities offered at a variety of times and places throughout the campus and the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods.

Policy 9.4: Only off-campus housing that meet minimum City Codes for safety should be recommended by The Ohio State University. All owners of university approved property should belong to an association which establishes standards for management, cleanliness and safety.

Recommendation 9.4.1: Establish a Property Owner's Association for all owners of university approved off-campus student housing and develop a university training program for resident student managers for approved off-campus student housing.

Recommendation 9.4.2: Implement a voluntary certificate of compliance program for student rentals that meet minimum city codes.

Policy 9.5: The university should promote an alcohol and drug free environment among its students, and the university should provide education to reduce the use and dependence on alcohol and other drugs among students. The university should also provide access to treatment for students with dependency on alcohol and other drugs.

Recommendation 9.5.1: Implement the recommendations of the university's Alcohol and Other Drug Advisory Committee.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Significant concerns about the quality of student life in the University District have contributed to enrollment declines in the university as well as the general erosion of the University District. Additional services in the community will provide greater access for students, enhance student quality of life, and increase the effectiveness of services delivered.

Apparent lack of responsibility and respect for the community where students live while attending The Ohio State University is a precipitating factor in the deterioration of the University District with the highest density of student residents. Students present in the University District for a limited time, may view themselves as transient residents, and are often living independent of adult supervision for the first time. Community service, especially if available in the University District, may foster a stronger sense of ownership and investment in the community leading to increased responsibility and respect for the area permanent residents, property.

Social, entertainment, cultural, and recreational opportunities are very limited in the neighborhoods where most students live. The exception is the high concentration of licensed bars close to campus. Funding for alternative activities at the university is far below the average of comparable institutions, approximately only 10% of what similar institutions spend. A diverse program of student social, cultural, educational, recreational, and entertainment activities would enhance the quality of life of all university students.

Standards of quality for student housing in the University Neighborhoods should be established jointly by property owners and the university to ensure that the special needs of a high density, young adult population are addressed in building management policies, safety standards, and requirements for health and safety. A Property Owners Association (see Chapter 6.0) could improve the image and safety of the area enhancing the value of property, improve occupancy rates, and yield better returns for owners. Such an association could also

ensure increased quality of life for student residents. Trained resident student managers could provide local oversight, be available for mediation and intervention as appropriate, and ensure proper respect for property as well as persons.

Excessive use and dependence on alcohol and other drugs is a serious contributor to reducing quality of life both on and off campus. According to the university's Alcohol and Other Drug Advisory Committee, there is no consistent message in the university regarding alcohol use, the consequences of use, policies, and enforcement. Information is scattered and resources to effect significant changes in attitudes and behavior are severely limited. The Code of Conduct should be reviewed and revised (see Chapter 10.0). The accessibility and adequacy of de-tox, treatment and referral services should be assessed. Codes and liquor laws may need to be more effectively communicated to students, and the enforcement efforts of local authorities may need increased support.

D. Programs and Concepts

Off-Campus Student Services Center: The Center will contribute to the quality of life of students living in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods by providing such services as:

- A community-based, integrated approach to housing needs using existing housing services located in the Off-Campus Student Office;
- Academic learning assistance to encourage accessibility by virtue of location; services would include teaching existing College of Education study skill courses and a satellite of the proposed Academic Learning Center;
- Student health education, promotion, and information dissemination building on existing health education services offered at the Student Health Center by increasing accessibility for students living in the East, North and South Campus neighborhoods as well as providing existing undergraduate Health Education courses - e.g., AIDS, STDs, Nutrition, Stress Reduction;
- Student counseling services including practical experiences for graduate students from the Department of Educational Services and Research counselor education program; and
- Primary health care screening including a nurse on part-time duty in the evenings and a physician available on an occasional basis.

Students living in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods will have greatly enhanced access to a wide range of student services. Faculty and student services providers would also benefit by being able to provide more efficient and accessible teaching, services, and assistance for students. Faculty who develop research in conjunction with student service activities will also benefit from increased student participation in these programs.

The impact of this center will include creation of neighborhood visibility for student services provided by the university. It will bring learning assistance, counseling, health education, and other services into geographic proximity to students who live east of High Street. Additional teaching and inquiry opportunities for faculty and graduate students will be created by greater participation in university-provided services. This program will assist in bridging the High Street barrier and encourage a greater sense of unity within the University District. The proposal also capitalizes on the University District's single greatest asset, its proximity to Ohio State, to make the neighborhood more desirable to prospective and current student residents.

Expanded Community Service Opportunities: Expanded Community Service Opportunities will be developed for all university students, faculty, and staff to participate in community service, especially in the University District. Students will be required to earn community service credit to graduate where feasible. Such credit may be for service directly related to their field of study, and will therefore enhance their academic career. Faculty and non-classified staff will be encouraged to engage in community service in conjunction with their employment. Service in any location will be accepted, but development of service opportunities in the University District will be encouraged.

Students who participate in community service and action/reflection courses and faculty who teach those courses will benefit from hands-on experience. Faculty and staff who volunteer in the University District will profit from increased contact with their neighbors, thus creating a safer, better community in which to work

and live. Faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities for research on community service, volunteerism, and their impact on community. University District residents and agencies will benefit from additional volunteer assistance. Students who live in University District will have an enhanced sense of ownership, respect, and responsibility for the areas in which they live.

This program will create a learning/serving experience and opportunity for all students through community service. It establishes a life-skill requirement for all students to learn how to live in a community with instructional teams consisting of faculty and community leaders. It promotes increased university participation in the life of the community. It enhances faculty and graduate student teaching and research opportunities. It will require the designation of a university contact person to serve as liaison with the community and coordinator of requests for volunteers for ease of contact and elimination of red tape.

Student Activities: Additional student activities would provide social activities for students interested in alternatives to alcohol consumption at local bars. Activities might include a full range of first-run, art, and dramatic films shown at different locations on and off campus, improved intramural facilities, and social events. The full range of activities could be presented to prospective students and parents in recruitment information as well as to new students and parents during orientation.

Students would benefit from alternative actions closer to their place of residence. Neighborhood residents would benefit from more organized student activities. Police expenditures would decrease because increased alternative activities would translate into fewer calls for disorderly conduct, noise, etc.

Implementation of the university's Alcohol and Other Drug Advisory Committee: Students will benefit from increased support services and education related to the use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs. Residents will benefit from a better educated student population. The City will benefit from reduced law enforcement costs. Specific recommendations made by the alcohol and other Drug Advisory Committee include:

- Create a consistent message regarding alcohol use, consequences of use, policies and enforcement.
- Increase efforts to gather accurate information about the use of alcohol and other drugs.
- Provide additional resources for education and programs capable of affecting attitude and behavior change.
- Review and enforce the University Code of Conduct.
- Provide adequate de-tox treatment and referral through University Medical Center.
- Support the efforts of the Columbus Division of Police and University Police.
- Support underage drinking code enforcement.
- Increase communication and awareness with the State Liquor Control Commission.

Core Value #4: The University District shall be a neighborhood of choice.

This is one of five chapters that address safety and law enforcement, community schools, circulation, transit, and parking of the Neighborhoods. Being a neighborhood of choice requires that streets and parking areas are safe and access is adequate to public transit and other key services such as quality community schools.

Safety and Law Enforcement

The level of crime activity in the University Neighborhoods has been increasing in recent years and reflects trends in similar inner-city neighborhoods across America. This chapter explores the reasons for increased crime in the Neighborhoods, and suggests programs and policies that can turn the situation from negative to positive. The institution of community policing in the Neighborhoods has already begun and will be a centerpiece in the community's revitalization.

Community Schools

Due to the proximity of the Neighborhoods to the university, the schools in the area can become some of the best in the City, sharing the resources of the university faculty and programs. The basic premise of Chapter 11.0 is to enhance and increase the opportunities for the schools to become "teaching schools." An important linkage through to technology to electronic information at The Ohio State University should not be overlooked as a cornerstone for improved education.

Vehicular Circulation

Improving the District circulation is essential to improving the quality of life in the residential Neighborhoods. Discouraging major traffic through quiet Neighborhoods and directing that traffic to the major community job generators such as The Ohio State University is a goal of the Plan. Similarly, commercial establishments in the area require a well-defined and recognizable street pattern that affords customer accessibility and allows for adequate service. The definition and recommendations of the street hierarchy/circulation and the issues of defensible space are discussed in Chapter 12.0.

Transportation Alternatives

While resolving District-wide vehicular circulation problems will relieve many of the problems, the Neighborhoods need additional access to public transit and designation of streets and paths for safe pedestrian and bicycle routes. In particular, the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods with the high concentration of students require safe and reliable streets and transportation alternatives to and from the university. Chapter 13.0 provides transportation alternatives recommendations.

Parking

The relationship between parking and land use is symbiotic; the University Neighborhoods have historically had too little parking to meet demand. During the nine months of the year when students are in school, the undersupply of available parking spaces is magnified. Additional parking problems abound with relation to the revitalization of High Street. Commercial retailers demand an adequate supply of close parking which currently does not exist. Chapter 14.0 explores the parking problems in both the residential and commercial areas, and suggest ways to alleviate the problems.

10.0 SAFETY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

A. Objectives

The primary area of concern for current and prospective residents and businesses in the University Neighborhoods is the perceived and actual problems related to crime and law enforcement. General consensus exists that no sustainable change to the living, working, recreational, or learning environment can occur without major improvements in public safety.

However, policing America in the 1990s is an especially complex and increasingly dangerous enterprise. The high volume of drugs, drug-related crime, and the high levels of violence and fear associated with the proliferation of guns on our streets has aggravated the challenge of maintaining order, controlling crime, and providing services.

The more progressive law enforcement officials and the more enlightened citizens understand that the challenge of policing and providing for the safety of citizens, families, and communities is one that cannot be accomplished by the police alone. Every element of the community must strive to find the role it needs to play in working with the police in establishing and sustaining a close alliance for dealing effectively with the

challenges of crime. Much of the crime in our streets is related to chronic, deep, and structural problems like poverty, unemployment, racial and ethnic clashes, and troubled schools that are beyond the control of our police departments. Yet, the police are called upon to impact the criminal manifestations of these deeper issues; how they perform can and will make a difference in the character of life in their respective cities.

These issues of preventing and fighting crime and establishing good relationships with citizens provide the basis for the following objectives for improved public safety in the University District:

Objective 1: Reduce crime and increase the feeling of safety within the University District.

Objective 2: Improve police visibility and response times in Neighborhoods.

Objective 3 Reverse negative community perceptions about police professionalism.

Objective 4: Effectively address disorderly behavior of students and other patrons of High Street.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 10.1: Develop programs that create a sense of partnership between police and communities being policed.

Recommendation 10.1.1: Deploy and expand current proposals for Community Policing with the University Neighborhoods as the pilot program area.

Recommendation 10.1.2: Plan expansion of the Community Crime Patrol.

- Work with CCP Board to plan expansion, both in terms of hours of operation and geographic boundaries.
- Identify means of additional support so CCP can expand its service delivery (hours) in those areas where it now operates.
- Work with CCP to establish the same relationship with Ohio State-PD that it has with CDP and the Sheriff's Department.

Recommendation 10.1.3: Expand upon existing police programs to implement community policing in accordance with the following three key parameters:

- Intra-agency organizational change,
- Inter-agency organizational change, and
- Mapping the community.

Policy 10.2: Develop officers who are more sensitive, creative, and flexible in their response to important community issues.

Recommendation 10.2.1: Begin to develop positive relationships between the City, The Ohio State University, and community anchors. Conduct police sensitivity training for officers assigned to the area.

Recommendation 10.2.2: Encourage police officers to invent new responses to chronic problems that face them in the Neighborhoods daily.

Recommendation 10.2.3: Begin developing an Eyes and Ears Program.

Recommendation 10.2.4: Require officers working in the University District to be involved in community-relations programs.

Recommendation 10.2.5: Explore homeownership incentives for police officers to live in the University District.

Policy 10.3: Balance police attention between High Street and the Neighborhoods in correlation with their respective levels of crime and violence.

Recommendation 10.3.1: Work with Neighborhoods of Choice Coordinating Committee to develop a Super Agency to coordinate delivery of intervention services and address the following:

- Additional participants (representatives from relevant City, university, and community organizations) need to be identified.
- Precise structure and membership needs to be determined.
- Mode of operation needs to be decided.
- Priorities and follow-up need to be established.

Policy 10.4: Strengthen and expand existing programs at The Ohio State University which prepare students to live on their own off campus and to understand the responsibilities and behavior expected of them.

Recommendation 10.4.1: Enhance programs at the university which provide students with information on personal safety, rental housing, neighborhood expectations and character, and life skills to live off campus.

Recommendation 10.4.2: Enhance programs at the university which address the problem of students who abuse alcohol and other drugs and who are drunk and disorderly in public areas.

Recommendation 10.4.3: Inform students about and enforce the existing provisions of the university's Code of Student Conduct which prohibits certain misconduct by students while involved with a university related activity or a student organization activity. The code already applies to such activity, whether on or off campus.

Policy 10.5: Recognize that the police division is only one of the City's problem-solving mechanisms, and consequently, consider important roles that other agencies and residents have, or could have, in working with police to address neighborhood living conditions.

Recommendation 10.5.1: Begin studying the potential for expansion of the Mutual Aid Pact between Ohio State University Police and the Columbus Division of Police.

Recommendation 10.5.2: Seek approval from the Mayor for the creation of the Community Service Aide position, and determine the specific role of other social services.

Recommendation 10.5.3: Work with the City Recreation and Parks Department and with the Wexner Center to develop a Comprehensive Youth Outreach Program. Action steps would include the following:

- Identify additional organizations in the City for participation.
- Increase transportation resources beyond the four vans currently assigned to provide access to the City's 28 recreational centers.
- Develop a neighborhood-based mechanism for determining the nature and magnitude of youth needs and for addressing these needs.

Recommendation 10.5.4: Encourage landlords to run Police checks on potential tenants.

Recommendation 10.5.5: Develop a better approach for representing crime statistics so that large areas of the community are not negatively portrayed for small isolated areas of high crime.

Recommendation 10.5.6: Public telephones restricted for outgoing calls only, should be located in key locations throughout the University District.

Recommendation 10.5.7: Improve levels of street lighting in critical areas where high levels of evening and late night pedestrian traffic occur, predominantly in the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods. Improve overall lighting in other neighborhoods by either trimming trees that obscure existing lights or increasing number and brightness of fixtures.

Policy 10.6: Address current shortages in supervisory and patrol staff and re-prioritize activities.

Recommendation 10.6.1: Consider redefining cruiser districts to optimize police presence.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Crime Conditions in the University District: The following is a summary of current crime conditions, based on analyses of both incident reports and arrest data:

Crime in the University District (excluding The Ohio State University) based on 1994 figures:

- The per capita rate of violent crimes is 14.2% higher for the University Neighborhoods than for the City as a whole, although rates of rape and homicide are lower for the University Neighborhoods than for the City.
- The per capita rate of property crimes in the University Neighborhoods is 21.6% higher than for the City.
- The substantial majority of arrested offenders (75%) reside in the areas in which the offenses were committed. The figure reached as high as 93.2% in 1988.
- The last decade has witnessed an overall increase in violent crime (murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) from under 400 cases in 1985 to 500 incidents in 1994.
- The precinct encompassing the University District has averaged four homicides a year.
- Incidences of rape have fluctuated steadily since 1984 between 30 and 60 reports annually.
- Less serious property crimes (burglary and larceny) have decreased since 1984, but more serious incidents have increased by 50%.
- Auto theft has increased 81% since 1984.
- Arrests for violent offenses increased from 1984 to 1994 and have included juveniles at an increasing rate.

Crime at The Ohio State University:

- The university has experienced two homicides between 1984 and 1994.
- Larcenies have decreased by 25% since 1984.
- The annual number of auto thefts has doubled between 1984 and 1994.

The following conclusions about crime in the University District may be stated:

1. Serious crime, defined as Part 1 offenses (as well as some less serious crime defined as Part 2 offenses) are on the increase.
2. The University Neighborhoods area has a considerable higher violent and property crime rates than the city of Columbus.
3. Juveniles are increasingly more involved in serious crime.
4. Most of the serious offenders are males.
5. Blacks are disproportionately over-represented in the offender and arrested populations.
6. Violent victimization is found in greater proportions in Cruiser Districts 46 and 47 where the typical victims are black females, while in other districts they are white males (females when rape is the offense).
7. The majority of the offenders live in the area where they committed their crimes.

The Culture of Alcohol Abuse: A compelling set of concerns exist around alcohol, the high concentration of bars, and the many problems related to them including underage drinking and drunkenness. Particularly, high school age students are found in the area because of its youth culture and the easy availability of alcohol. Evidence suggests that these activities lead to such crimes as robberies and assaults where students are both victim and perpetrator. Such problems are aggravated by the attraction that the area has for large numbers of non-students, some of whom view the opportunity as easy pickings for criminal behavior. Notwithstanding an increasing number of police officers and special units assigned to the area, there has been no significant decrease in the nature of the problems. There are, however, several other important issues generated by the perceptions and realities of the intractable High Street experience that tend to reinforce its existence; and do so at the expense of the police and neighboring communities.

A growing number of police officers and citizens believe that the negative aspects of the High Street experience would not exist if there were unambiguous messages from the leadership of the City and, especially, the university condemning the behavior. The message that exists now suggests that students and visitors coming to the area are above the law and that their behavior is acceptable. One of the important consequences of this subculture continuing is that it places an immense burden on the police; a growing number of its officers are assigned to the area at the expense of good relations with adjacent communities. A common complaint from CDP is the lack of university enforcement of a student code of conduct.

Community-Police Relations: Residents of the University District have expressed considerable concern about police arrogance and unapproachable behavior. The feelings of these citizens is that there is a need for better recruitment and higher standards of training, especially cultural sensitivity and competencies. The need for police officers to get out of their cars and to engage the community is often cited among citizens concerned about improving the relationship between their police department and their community. Finally, many express concern that the police are not marketing themselves effectively to win the community on its side. Consequently, people call the police only when there is an absolute need to do so.

The CDP is aware of the need for their officers to spend more time in positive interaction with citizens. Indeed, that is a primary reason for their Park, Walk, and Talk program. For the most part, this appears to be only a paper program. There is very little indication that supervisors either encourage it or are held accountable for seeing that it is done. Nor are officers held accountable for spending time with this program. One of the reasons offered is too few supervisors to allow for effective supervision.

Problems with police relations are especially prevalent in the Weinland Park area. The neighborhood is considered the "hot spot" because its high volume of serious crime, even relative to the rest of the study area. Residents in this area feel ignored by the City both in absolute terms and in comparison to other communities. The neighborhood is particularly void of the kind of relations that generate the mutual respect needed to address the many problems that make life very difficult for both those who live there and for those having responsibility for delivering police services to the area. The arrest of the Short North Posse in this area has had a substantial positive impact on crime in this area and the City and District Attorney's Office are to be congratulated on cleaning up the area and beginning a summer Youth Enrichment Program.

The recent designation of the Weinland Park community as a pilot project for community policing efforts is encouraging because it recognizes that something different needs to be done to address the issues of crime and alienation, and to bring a more comprehensive approach to the problems in that community, including the involvement of the citizens in addressing those problems.

Response Times: A major complaint from residents in the University District is that police visibility and response time are not very good. Citizens have expressed their anger about the impact drug trafficking is having on the quality of life in their neighborhood and the absence of a concerted police effort to stop it. In particular, they do not understand how relatively low levels of violence on High Street are more compelling and receive more police attention than their neighborhood needs. The police also have difficulty justifying the difference in attention.

The current lack of police visibility is due in part to shortages in supervisors. Sergeants speak of the frequency with which they have to "double" and "triple." Doubling means that in addition to supervising their precinct, they have to supervise another as well because there is no other sergeant on duty. Tripling means covering two other precincts in addition to one's own precinct. This means that officers in the field do not get the supervision needed under the style of policing that this division is currently committed to.

The need for more police officers is also apparent at the patrol level. Because there are not enough relief officers to cover for the regular officers who are out sick, on vacation or in training, the cruiser districts are frequently not fully staffed. The term "laid in" is used to describe a car out of service because an officer is not available. The consequences of officer shortage include the following:

- Officers from one precinct may be dispatched to another precinct to handle a call for service. Doing so aggravates the shortage problem in the precinct sending the officer.

- Officers may elect to give an arrestee a summons to appear in court rather than making a physical arrest when doing so would be the more prudent action. Making the physical arrest would be more time consuming thus reducing his time of availability to respond to other calls for service.
- Well-meaning programs such as Park, Walk, and Talk, cannot be adequately supervised.
- Officers cannot be creative in their approaches to solving community problems when they are involved in responding to one call after the other with no time for anything else.

The CDP has taken a number of steps in the last three years to improve police services, including freeing more officers from administrative responsibilities to function in an enforcement capacity. The combination of a growing City population, increases in violent crime, and other calls for service suggest very strongly the need for an in-depth evaluation regarding the need for additional officers and the most effective means for deploying them. These are issues that can be considered under CDP's new re-organization plan. The cruiser districts need to be smaller and more consistent with the boundaries of the precinct's neighborhoods.

Current Organizational Structure and Staffing Patterns in the University District:

The city of Columbus is divided into four police zones under the direction of the deputy chief of the patrol subdivision. Each zone is headed by a commander who reports to the deputy chief. The study area, except for a small piece in the southwest corner, is in zone 4. The zone is divided into five precincts, each headed by a sergeant; there are three watches: first, second, and third. The watches (shifts) change at 6 a.m. or 7 a.m. depending on the precinct and then after every eight hours. Three regularly assigned lieutenants act as watch commanders on their respective watches and, in effect, are in charge of the entire zone during that period. Two relief lieutenants are assigned to the zone and occasionally fill in for the regular lieutenants when the latter are involved in training or are off duty for other reasons, such as vacation or sick leave. The relief lieutenants are frequently involved in planning/conducting special operations such as ACE and SCAT activities. There are two relief sergeants assigned on each shift to fill in for the regular sergeants when they are off duty.

At any given time approximately 150 uniformed officers are policing the city of Columbus. For special events and activities, such as football games and the annual 4th of July activities, there are far more. Usually the study area will have a larger proportion of the policing effort responding to The Ohio State University-generated activities and the high concentration of bars. The staffing of Precinct 4, which has responsibility for one of the City's highest crime areas, would normally be as follows: On first shift: four cruisers (cars) and a patrol transport vehicle (paddy wagon); second shift: five cruisers, patrol transport vehicle, and a two-officer walking crew; third shift: five cruisers and a patrol transport vehicle. All patrol transport vehicles have two officers. Additionally, there are officers assigned to midwatch hours. That is, there is one officer assigned from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m. and two officers assigned from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.; and there are two officers in service from 7 p.m. to 3 a.m.

This staffing arrangement means that the number of cruiser districts (the geographical area patrolled by a police officer during a particular watch/shift and unless otherwise directed, the police officer is dedicated to servicing citizens in that area) varies depending on the time of day. For example, there are five cruiser districts from 6 a.m. to 11 a.m.; six districts from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m.; seven districts from 7 p.m. to 3 a.m.; and five districts from 3 a.m. to 6 a.m. The cruiser districts are determined by the Research and Development unit of the CDP based on its analysis of crime data, demographic information, and response time.

Existing Special Programs: A number of CDP and neighborhood-based special programs are already in place in the University Neighborhoods. These include the following:

- **Street Crime Attack Team (SCAT)** - This team consists of six officers and a sergeant who report to a lieutenant. The officers are on six-month temporary assignments and come from the ranks of patrol officers from zones 1 and 4. These officers work in plain clothes and address the problems of street drug sales and prostitution. This team also conducts surveillance and addresses other specifics as requested by any precinct sergeant in zones 1 and 4.

This unit has potential to be far more effective. The unit is a morale booster for its participants, in part because it gives otherwise uniformed officers the opportunity to work in plainclothes and address important crime problems. There are, however, some territorial and communication problems that

diminish the unit's ability to carry out its mission. One of these problems stems from status distinctions between plainclothes and uniform officers, which hampers their ability to communicate effectively. A larger communication problem manifests itself, at times, between the leadership of the unit and the specific precinct sergeant. These problems are apparently small enough that if addressed now, they will allow what is otherwise a good program to realize its potential.

- **The Active Criminal Eviction Project (ACE)** - This project operates throughout the City during the summer. It is staffed by six officers and sergeants per shift working overtime, and is funded by an annual grant from the City Council. The 1995 ACE program allows officers to work precinct cruisers while the precinct officers are addressing specific problems in their area which have been identified by the precinct sergeant.

The concept of ACE is to saturate an area with officers for up to 30 days to rid the area of a given problem. While the police effort seems to be effective in ridding the area of a particular problem or diminishing its effects while they are on the scene, many believe such a program merely displaces problems to other areas or are only effective for the period of elevated police presence. Such a weeding program could be more effective if followed up by a "seeding" effort involving other agencies.

- **The Intoxicated Pedestrian Project** - This project is a short-term, state-funded effort to target drunken pedestrians who are likely to become petty criminals (public indecency, fighting) and/or victims (robbery, assaults) which plague the area. There is a sergeant and six officers who work overtime on Friday and Saturday nights in the university area. This project is part of the overall police effort to reduce the negative effects of the High Street subculture. It is too early to assess the effectiveness of its operations. If the efforts of this unit are not accompanied by equally aggressive proactive and prevention-oriented activities to address the High Street problems, this unit will be spending its time processing more and more people into the criminal justice system without substantially diminishing the circumstances that are generating the behavior of those targeted.
- **Park, Walk, and Talk** - This program directs officers to spend some portion of their day getting out of their vehicles and interacting positively with neighborhood citizens. Precinct sergeants are directed to record how much of their officers' time is spent in this fashion. Officers exaggerate the amount of time spent, and no one is held accountable for seeing that officers are actually in compliance with the directive. The problem of too few supervisors makes it almost impossible for sergeants to inspect the level of compliance with this directive.
- **Community Crime Patrol, Inc.** - This agency employs part-time trained citizens who patrol selected non-high crime areas in teams of two from 9 p.m. to 3 a.m. every night. They are equipped with whistles and walkie-talkies on the university communication system that permit communications with the sheriff's department, the Columbus Division of Police and University Police. A deputy sheriff and a Columbus police officer are assigned to the unit. These citizens are the eyes and ears of the respective law enforcement agencies. Their activities have lead to the apprehension of many criminals and the prevention of many crimes. Additionally, they have rendered assistance to a large number of victims.

The unit enjoys a fine reputation with law enforcement and with an increasing number of citizens who are requesting their presence in neighborhoods where they live. This program appears to be a great return for a small investment

The CDP has also been evaluating the idea of community policing and has planted some seeds of community policing through isolated programmatic efforts. With a grant from the Federal government to implement community policing, an allocation from the City Council for community policing, and a plan to re-organize the division, the CDP will be involved in a transitional process of divorcing itself from some of the traditional ways of policing as it embraces a course of action to bring excellence in policing to the city of Columbus and to the University Neighborhoods area. The CDP will be involved in the challenge of building on the richness of its experiences to include a broader community-based approach to the many challenges facing it, the City, and its neighborhoods. Community policing will provide the opportunity to be more innovative and effective in addressing them. This is a worthwhile undertaking by the CDP.

Current And Recent Community Programs: Several efforts have been underway to curb crime in the area and provide positive outlets for neighborhood youth.

- **Campus Partners Safety Coordinating Committee:** The Community Affairs Committee of the Campus Partners Board of Trustees convened the Safety Coordinating Committee in 1995. The committee is chaired by Mark Hatch, Director of the Community Crime Patrol, and is comprised of representatives of Columbus Division of Police, Ohio Department of Public Safety - Liquor Enforcement, University Police, Office of Student Affairs, Campus Partners, Ohio State administration and student body, and representatives of the University Neighborhoods community. The committee shares information about upcoming events and activities in the University District that could potentially cause safety problems. The committee also encourages networking and cooperation among the various offices and units concerned about public safety along High Street and in the East Campus neighborhood.
- **Drug Sweep:** In March of 1995, Federal and local police authorities orchestrated a sweep of areas in the study area known for drug activity. The raid resulted in 44 convictions, with sentences up to 33 years. None of the convicted are eligible for parole.
- **Summer Enrichment Program:** Last summer, the Weinland Park Community Collaborative, with the assistance of the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Office of the Mayor, launched the six-week Weinland Park Summer Enrichment Program. The program was designed to instruct children from kindergarten through the sixth grade in drama, dance, reading skills, soccer, and basketball.

The program was also sponsored by the Godman Guild, Weinland Park Elementary School, Nationwide Insurance Company, and Campus Partners. Plans are underway to hold an enrichment program annually. The program was initiated as a "seed" effort following the "weeding" of drug activity in March 1995.

D. Programs and Concepts

Community Policing: Community policing is an innovative approach to determine how crime is produced in society. The underlying assumption of community policing is that community criminogenic elements are conducive to crime production and that traditional reactive law enforcement failed to provide an adequate response to the crime problem.

"Community Policing," as defined by Robert Friedmann in a book titled "Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects," is a policy and strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services, and police legitimacy through a *proactive reliance* on community resources that seeks to change crime-causing conditions. It assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision-making, and greater concern for civil rights and liberties.

Community policing is not merely foot patrol even though it has certainly brought officers back to the community, but it is still not very clear what is it that officers do on foot that makes an impact on crime (that they do not do in their vehicles). Community policing offers a comprehensive approach and elevates observation (and intervention) to a higher level than just managing crime after it happens. It is proactive and it should be offered in addition to, not instead of, reactive policing.

Community policing evolved as a response to police professionalism which itself was a development in the policing movement that reacted to officers being too close to the community and thus being in danger of corruption and abuse of service responsibilities. However, police professionalism resulted in distancing police from the community and thus the loss of intelligence base, cooperation of citizens, support, and trust.

In the 1980s, community policing became a "buzz-word" for law enforcement and turned into the latest development in the policing movement. The majority of law enforcement agencies have adapted some form of it. However, there are no clear-cut standards and many departments adopt various elements of it; community

policing thus means different things to law enforcement jurisdictions. It is safe to say that community policing is in some sense elusive and is approachable in different theoretical and operational ways.

Community policing has at least three key parameters:

- Intra-agency organizational change
- Inter-agency organizational change
- Mapping the community

The following is an outline of the important components of each of these parameters.

Intra-agency organizational change refers to changes in organizational structure (decentralization), communication patterns (more open), supervision (increased interaction), increased officers' discretion, recruitment of mediation-oriented officers, expansion of community-policing training, match performance evaluation to performance criteria, match rewards with performance, and extent scope of community policing.

Inter-agency organizational change refers to changes in interaction patterns between agencies (flatten), increase organizational knowledge on needs and resources, identification of possible patterns of resistance and of support, define jurisdiction, reward cooperation and enhance coordination. This could be done with the creation of the Super Agency.

Mapping the community, or taking inventory, refers to better understanding the crime picture through improved statistical analysis and the use of GIS but even beyond that to learn more about the community being served, the intervention required, coordination efforts required, and the strengthening of traditional social control mechanisms to include the family, church, school, and various civic associations.

It is important for community policing to involve the media to assist in disseminating "positive" stories on police, community, and individuals. There is a window of opportunity epitomized by the Mutual Aid Pact between CDP and The Ohio State University Police, by the Campus Partnership development program, by the Community Crime Patrol, and by City attention to community policing. It is important to take advantage of this opportunity and watch for various pitfalls in implementing community policing in the University Neighborhoods area. It is important to note that community policing is not equal to foot-patrol, that fighting fear of crime is not enough, that there is a need to buy into a long-term, thorough plan or otherwise risk losing support, and that there is a need for solid external support.

It is essential that the City leadership (elected and appointed) buy into the concept of community policing to guarantee any thorough implementation and start a process that will make it become a reality. To that effect, meetings need to be continued with key leadership groups and individuals to ascertain the extent to which they are receptive to these recommendations.

CDP needs to implement the MAPP concept and utilize the City's \$1 million grant for community policing and implement the Federal grant CDP received recently.

Super Agency: This facilitating coordinating mechanism is suggested to enhance service delivery and various City and other interventions. Membership ought to be at the highest level and could use as a start the existing City's Neighborhoods of Choice Coordinating Committee as well as added members (e.g., Mayor's chief of staff as potential chair, chief or deputy chief, department heads, Ohio State, the business community). If the highest level representatives cannot participate on a regular basis, the Super Agency format can still be an effective coordinating tool if other representatives with appropriate authority participate.

The Super Agency needs to meet on a regular basis (2 to 3 times a month) and maintain interest, permanence, and continuity of its activities, effectiveness, and membership. Preliminary explorations with CDP have met with great enthusiasm concerning the concept and a desire to adopt and implement it.

Community Service Aide: CSAs are seen as working with CDP community police officers (as well as other service agencies) to identify community and social problems, mobilize community participation, develop community leadership, and address existing problems. For example, focusing on truancy, public health, and

physical deterioration are some issues where CSAs - as paraprofessionals - could assist police and other agencies.

Expand Cooperation Between The Ohio State University Police and CDP: On the basis of the Mutual Aid Pact between the two departments, cooperation could be expanded to include proactive policing. The police departments and the university community need to work closer together to enforce student code of conduct and to present a less tolerant attitude toward infractions of law and order.

The idea is not to provide additional officers, but to develop a stronger relationship between the university and the Columbus police forces. There is joint planning and information sharing between the two police units, but the mutual aid compact is circumscribed by jurisdictional limits and is primarily concerned with cooperation in emergency situations. The pact should be strengthened to encourage additional joint activities and to promote proactive policing that would fit well within the recommended community policing construct.

Student Conduct Off-Campus: Many non-student residents and local law enforcement personnel believe that many of the safety-related problems in the University Neighborhoods area a function of student behavior. While The Ohio State University enforces a Code of Student Conduct which sets a minimum level of acceptable behavior by its students, the university is seen as tolerating, if not condoning, negative incidents involving students which occur off the university property.

The Ohio State University has publicly denounced disruptive behavior of students off-campus, but the law enforcement community and residents expect the university to take more aggressive action. Ohio State's Code of Student Conduct already applies to student behavior both on-and-off-campus while students are participating in university-sponsored activities or activities sponsored by registered student organizations. The university should inform its students of the code and its application and should enforce its provisions. In addition, the university should strengthen and expand programs which will assist students, particularly first-and second year students, in understanding the responsibilities they must assume in living on their own in a neighborhood. The programs also should address personal safety, tenant-landlord issues, alcohol and drug abuse, and misconduct.

Eyes and Ears Programs: As part of the City's acknowledgment that police alone cannot do the job of crime control, this program builds on the City's ability to provide additional "eyes and ears" to police efforts and to encourage non-City agencies to do the same. This could be done by mandating all City employees who operate two-way radio-equipped vehicles and/or who have two-way radios to receive police training in how to observe their surroundings and how to notify police immediately of suspicious activities observed in the course of carrying out their primary functions. This program would also encourage the postal service, the power and gas companies, and others to be involved in this effort.

The key to a successful eyes and ears program will be implementation. The implementation process must include participants buying into the idea by clearly identifying the benefits -to all parties- that will result from their participation.

Comprehensive Youth Outreach Programs: With youths a major element of disorderly and criminal behavior and often associated with blight and disadvantage, a major effort needs to focus on enriching the lives of youth in the University Neighborhoods. A comprehensive approach that views the neighborhood and the individual child as a whole should be developed and implemented rather than focusing on a single activity.

The program should rely on a variety of components such as athletic activities, involvement in the arts, educational programs, mentoring, and neighborhood cleanup projects. Initial exploration of the comprehensive concept was met with approval by representatives of the Wexner Center for the Arts and with the City's Recreation and Parks Department. Officials of the Recreation and Parks Department agree there is a need for a more aggressive outreach program targeting the large number of youth who live too far away from a recreation center to have maximum involvement in the center's programs. The Recreation and Parks Department is an appropriate candidate to operate the comprehensive outreach program, and would manage the involvement of other City and university organizations, including the Wexner Center.

A collaborative group called The Community for a New Direction can be used as a model for communities such as Weinland Park to identify the exact nature of the outreach programs. The plan of action developed by this organization has a division of labor which includes the neighborhood schools, citizens and the Recreation and Parks Department playing roles in delivering services to their youth.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): The principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) need to be considered in any physical improvement. The program acknowledges that the built environment may influence criminal behavior and the subsequent perception of security and safety by users. The review process focuses on 1) the physical environment - design and use; 2) behavior in the environment - desirable, undesirable and territorial; and 3) the assignment and use of space.

The purpose is to "design in" and take advantage of the principles of natural surveillance, natural access control, and territorial behavior of the normal site users. Clearly designed "defensible" space will enhance the users' sense of ownership denying criminal anonymity and unhindered access to assets.

Neighborhood Housing Loans: It is a widely accepted belief within police circles and with the general public that the quality of policing provided by an officer is better if done where the officers and their families live. This belief is why efforts continue for police officers to live in the community where they work. One disincentive is that frequently the officers receive a better real estate package for their money outside the City with the added attraction of suburban life as (among others) being safer than the inner City.

There are areas in the City, such as the University District, that can benefit from a greater police presence, infusion, visibility, and a kind of commitment to a community that comes from living and perhaps raising a family there. This notion of having stake-holders in the community should be applied not only to police officers but also to other City employees as well as university faculty and staff.

Expand Drug Treatment and After-Care: Given the direct relationship between drug addiction and crime, efforts need to focus on after-care for drug addicts in the community. While initially perceived as a high-end investment, this strategy is essential if an impact is to be achieved on the reduction of drug use by habitual users as well as rehabilitating them to return to responsible functioning in the community.

Community Crime Patrol (CCP) Expansion: CCP is a proven success story in the University Neighborhoods. It is highly respected by police and the community alike, it enjoys high levels of participation and cooperation, and has demonstrated both efficient and effective delivery of an essential community service. Requests for expansion of CCP have understandably come from both police and community circles, and for the long term such expansion would certainly be advantageous for the University Neighborhoods. However, CCP itself is concerned with too rapid and too wide an expansion which might detract from its ability to deliver quality service, this at a time when it attempts to solidify its services.

Utilize Community Anchors: The University Neighborhoods Revitalization offers a unique opportunity for development and re-development on one hand along with support and community involvement from various "community anchors" located in and operating side-by-side with the needy and problem-ridden neighborhoods.

The idea of utilizing community anchors has three relevant elements:

- The utilization of existing resources;
- Making those resources available to populations who traditionally did not have access to them; and
- Utilizing the anchors for outreach projects so that a partnership can be developed to replace alienation, distance, and the lack of community with their new sense of community and growth.

Anchors as large as The Ohio State University and as small as the Godman Guild could work together to enhance greater community involvement and participation. With the increasing interest that The Ohio State University is demonstrating toward its immediate physical and social surroundings, it needs to play a larger role in tackling major urban problems. This offers a unique opportunity for Ohio State to become a prototype of providing solutions to compelling urban problems.

11.0 COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

A. Objectives

Public education is a cornerstone in building an exemplary community committed to educational excellence. University faculty teaching and inquiry are critical resources for strengthening public school excellence in the University District. Schools that serve the children and families in the University District can become the best schools in the City through their proximity and programmatic linkage to the resources of The Ohio State University. They can serve as models for other schools throughout the area and nation. Schools play an expanded role in providing a forum of excellence for life-long learning and support for families as well as education for children. The schools serving the University District are strengthened by linkages with each other, community agencies and the university both programmatically and electronically. Again, the partnership between the community, its schools, and the university will establish a benchmark for creating an environment of educational excellence in urban areas.

The following objectives address the public schools in the University District:

Objective 1: Improve the quality of K-12 education in the University District to increase desirability for families to live in the area.

Objective 2: Increase professional development opportunities in University District schools for professionals, university faculty, and students.

Objective 3: Increase use of technology in university area schools.

Objective 4: Strengthen community learning opportunities for families in the University District.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 11.1: The number of "teaching schools" in the University District should be increased so that preparation of school professionals can occur in a teaching school context in which teachers, administrators, and other school-based professionals, faculty, and students explore and learn together. School professionals can be engaged directly in the university's programs to prepare their counterparts for the future.

Recommendation 11.1.1: Establish additional professional development schools, including faculty and student placements in University District schools.

Recommendation 11.1.2: Develop and provide additional seminars for teachers and other school professionals to improve skills in curriculum development and instructional strategies in urban schools.

Policy 11.2:

- University area schools should be technologically linked to each other and to the on-line resources of The Ohio State University and the Ohio Department of Education.
- Teachers in university area schools should be prepared to use computer technology in every phase of curriculum planning and delivery.
- Every classroom teacher in university area schools should have access to their own computers to enable regular use of computer technology.
- Each classroom in university area schools should be wired and have a sufficient number of terminals to allow students full access to computerized resources for learning and inquiry.
- All University District residents should have access through technology centers in public schools to training, hardware, and software to enable them to use computerized information sources for learning, inquiry, communication, and self-improvement.

Recommendation 11.2.1: Develop a Partnership for Technology in Education to link the 12 university area schools, Columbus Public Schools at its North Education Center, and The Ohio State University through its College of Education.

Policy 11.3: Increased learning opportunities should be available for all area residents.

Recommendation 11.3.1: Establish a Center for Community Learning in at least one university area school.

Policy 11.4: Support for families should be enhanced throughout the University District.

Recommendation 11.4.1: Establish a Family Focus Center in at least one university area school.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Strong public schools are essential to achieving the housing stabilization and home ownership goals of the Plan. Likewise, best practices in professional education preparation programs include strong teaching schools as the context in which to prepare future education professionals. Teaching schools also bring additional resources to the communities in which they are located and provide outstanding educational opportunities for public school pupils. Combining the strengths of school staff with those of university faculty and students from a number of disciplines to forge a strong alliance for preparing professionals may be the most effective means of assisting the schools in reaching their full potential.

The schools in the university area must prepare students to participate fully in the opportunities of the next decades. Many opportunities will depend on access to and knowledge of computerized information, learning, and communication. The Ohio State University is a major center for generating, storing, and disseminating electronic information related to education and a host of other disciplines. Linking area schools electronically to the university, building technology into the curriculum of the schools, and preparing teachers to use technology throughout their teaching will develop a strong and essential base for students to explore the world.

The revitalization concept calls for creating a model teaching and learning community characterized by educational excellence. Learning opportunities must be available for all residents to achieve their maximum educational and personal potential. Strengthening and supporting families is also an essential dimension of building a strong community. Both these policies build upon the Columbus Public Schools' 5-year Strategic Plan.

Schools Which Serve University District Children and Families		
School	Address	Mission
Fifth Avenue Elementary	1330 Forsythe	Traditional/Community
Hubbard Elementary	104 West Hubbard	Traditional/Community
Indianola Elementary	104 East 16th Avenue	Alternative-Informal/Literature Based
Medary Elementary	2500 Medary	Traditional/Community
Second Avenue Elementary	68 East 2nd Avenue	Traditional/Community
Weinland Park Elementary	211 East 7th Avenue	Traditional/Community
Everett Middle	100 West 4th Avenue	Traditional/Community
Indianola Middle	420 East 19th Avenue	Traditional/Community

Fort Hayes High School	546 Jack Gibbs Boulevard	Alternative- Arts/Academic/Career Ed
Linden McKinley H.S.	1320 Duxberry Avenue	Traditional/Community
North Adult Education Center	100 Arcadia Avenue	Education for those 16 and older/Community Outreach
Whetstone High School	4405 Scenic Drive	Traditional/Community

D. Programs and Concepts

Professional Development School Sites And Placements: Additional Professional Development School Sites and Placements in University District schools will expand opportunities for public school teachers; and other school professionals from a variety of disciplines and colleges; and pre-service students and faculty from the Colleges of Education, Social Work, Human Ecology, Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Health Sciences, and other colleges with interest and expertise to address the needs of urban school children and youth. This program will provide opportunities for pre-service students to learn to teach, offer counseling and health services, prepare for administrative posts, and provide other school-based services for children and their families in real classrooms and schools under the tutelage of practicing teachers, other professionals, and faculty from their college. It will also enable practicing teachers and other professionals in community schools to improve skills by collaborating with university faculty equipped with the most recent research on teaching and learning, school administration, counseling and health care, integrated service delivery and other urban school issues. Additional professional development school sites will also provide increased access to the schools for faculty interested in the needs of urban school teachers and youth.

Neighborhood residents, families, and children will benefit by having a more comprehensive approach to urban school issues and access to the most current research and technologies in education and other services. Current teachers and other school professionals will benefit by becoming part of the professional preparation team, having direct access to university faculty and current research, and by having a more direct mentoring and teaching relationship with pre-professional students in their field. University students and faculty will benefit from a comprehensive approach to professional development in actual urban sites.

This program will enhance the quality of schools in the University District by increasing contact with a variety of departments, students, and faculty in the university and greater access to the best research and thinking to address urban school issues. Expanded and comprehensive professional development school sites will provide a structure for improving teaching, learning, and other school services in urban settings. This program will also provide an ongoing forum for the discussion of educational policy and practices at both the local and State levels.

Off-Campus Seminars For Teachers: Developed by faculty from the College of Education, Off-Campus Seminars for Teachers will improve teacher skills in curriculum development and instructional strategies in urban schools. The seminars will provide access to continued professional development for the 300 teachers in the 12 schools serving University District residents. They will also provide opportunities for college faculty to work with practicing teachers to improve instructional techniques in urban schools as well as the development of a forum for discussion of educational policy and practices in urban schools.

Teachers will benefit from site-based continuing professional development opportunities that address their needs as urban school professionals. Neighborhood children and families will receive better instruction in the schools. Faculty and graduate students will have enhanced opportunities to develop and demonstrate urban education skills, programs and research.

This program will establish a systematic, school-based professional development opportunity for area educators based on their needs. It will also result in increased University District participation by university faculty and graduate students.

Partnership For Technology In Education: A Partnership for Technology in Education will be developed to link the 12 public schools serving University District residents, Columbus Public Schools, and The Ohio State University through its College of Education. The partnership will provide access to information systems for all teachers and other school professionals at the 12 schools as well as to residents through the North Education Center. School professionals and students will be able to access technologically based curricula and information systems. Low-income persons and others not likely to have such access and training will have access to computer technology and education. The partnership will provide an opportunity to develop a "Model for Collaboration" between schools and universities to help teachers and other school professionals and university faculty take advantage of innovative methods to improve teaching and learning in urban schools.

Teachers and other school professionals will benefit from training in the use of technology and access to state-of-the-art equipment. Neighborhood children and families will receive better instruction in the schools and enhanced access to technology. Faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities to develop and apply skills in the use of technological resources in urban education.

The Partnership for Technology in Education will enhance the technological resources of the university area schools and provide training opportunities for school professionals. It will consolidate distant education resources into one visible center along High Street that will serve as a technological nerve center and locale for outreach education to the community, county, state, and nation. The program will also provide a model for "Partnerships Between Schools and Universities" in bringing the latest technology to urban areas.

Family Focus Centers: As a part of the Columbus Public Schools' 5-year Strategic Plan, family Focus Centers will assist University District schools in developing and planning programs for strengthening families in the community. Faculty from the Colleges of Education, Social Work, and Human Ecology, the Health Sciences Center, and other interested departments will assist with program design. State departments and professional associations with an interest in collaborative, family-focused, child-centered urban support should also be included. The program will provide planning assistance to the Columbus Public Schools in conjunction with families and community agencies in establishing Family Focus Centers. It will be an opportunity for faculty and graduate students to use the centers as laboratories for learning how to best serve families. The program will establish important links between and among the University's Colleges of Education, Social Work, Human Ecology, and the Health Sciences Center.

Families will be strengthened through a school-based center. Children will have an improved family environment in which to grow and develop. The community will become stronger as families are strengthened. Faculty and graduate students will have increased opportunities to teach and study family skills and development in urban school contexts.

The centers will develop a collaboration between schools and the university that will assist University District families in becoming stable and healthy. They will strengthen the schools' role in supporting and nurturing families. Faculty and graduate and professional students will participate more fully in the life of University District.

Centers For Community Learning: Schools serving University District residents will become Centers for Community Learning, open evenings and weekends to make life-long learning opportunities available to all area residents. The university will provide planning and technical assistance to Columbus Public Schools in partnership with residents and interested community agencies as they design Centers for Community Learning. The centers will provide access to learning opportunities for community residents.

University District residents will benefit from extended hours and services at area schools.. University faculty will benefit by gaining access to sites in which adult learning will be the focus. This access will be particularly attractive to faculty with concentrations in Adult Education, Workforce Education, Health Education, and Adult Literacy. Faculty will have enhanced opportunities for both teaching and research through these sites.

Adult learning sites will assist residents in becoming economically self-sufficient. Their quality of life will be enhanced through additional community-based learning opportunities. The program will increase faculty and student participation in the life of the University District.

12.0 VEHICULAR CIRCULATION

A. Objectives

Solving many of the University Neighborhoods' problems will benefit from a circulation system that is easily accessed and understood. The quality of life within a residential neighborhood is determined by the relative degree of convenient movement afforded to its residents. Likewise, retailers and other businesses within the High Street Corridor depend on regional and local accessibility and adequate service alleys. Many of the issues discussed in this chapter are also linked to Chapters 13.0 and 14.0 (Transportation Alternatives and Parking).

The following objectives are the basis for the policies and recommendations discussed below:

Objective 1: Enhance regional accessibility and improve District circulation.

Objective 2: Enhance neighborhood access and circulation by regulating traffic flow, cut-through traffic, and travel speeds on local streets to enhance safety and quality of life within the Neighborhoods.

Objective 3: Enhance vehicular access and circulation along the High Street Corridor.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 12.1: Define a roadway system for the University Neighborhoods delineating a clear system of primary streets and neighborhood circulators for people moving either to, through, or within the District.

Recommendation 12.1.1: Maintain the major points of access to the District as Hudson Street, 17th Avenue, 11th Avenue, and 5th Avenue on the east; Dodridge Street, Lane Avenue, and 5th Avenue on the west; High Street and Indianola Avenue (north of Hudson Street) on the north; and High Street, Summit Street, and Fourth Street on the south. Discourage non District related traffic on other streets.

Recommendation 12.1.2: Over the near term retain Summit Street and Fourth Street as one-way minor arterials through the District, but diminish their traffic impacts by removing parking restrictions, creating landscaped neckdowns to narrow the physical width of the pavements (primarily at crosswalks), and maintain a 35 mph speed limit with recalibrated traffic signals and increased enforcement. Reevaluate two way operation in the future if traffic demand changes due to circulation revisions.

Recommendation 12.1.3: Retain High Street as a major north-south arterial but enhance its role as a major transit corridor connecting routes both within the University District and outside the region.

Recommendation 12.1.4: Create 11th Avenue as a single major collector from the east to High Street.

Policy 12.2: Create a second tier of roadways for internal movement within each neighborhood.

Recommendation 12.2.1: Recognize the following roadways as neighborhood collectors/circulators within the District: Neil Avenue (between Dodridge Street and Lane Avenue), Lane Avenue (between High Street and Summit Street), West 10th Avenue (between Neil Avenue and High Street), King Avenue / 7th Avenue (east to Fourth Street), and Neil Avenue (north to West 10th Avenue). East Woodruff Avenue (between High Street and Summit Street), Indianola Avenue, East 15th Avenue (between High Street and The Conrail Tracks), and East 12th Avenue (between High Street and Summit Street).

Policy 12.3: Provide two-way circulation on neighborhood streets, where possible, being particularly sensitive to parking needs.

Recommendation 12.3.1: Convert the following street segments to two-way operation: West 10th Avenue, East 11th Avenue, West 11th Avenue, East 12th Avenue (between High Street and Summit Street), East 15th

Avenue (between Pearl Street and Fourth Street), and West Patterson Avenue. Realignment to two way traffic should occur only after provisions are identified for replacing on street parking lost to traffic lanes.

Policy 12.4: Minimize the volume of traffic passing through the Neighborhoods through the application of traffic-calming techniques and where necessary to address crime mitigation using street closures.

Recommendation 12.4.1: Modify Big Four Alley by creating a series of closed loops which provide local circulation but eliminate the use of the street as a raceway and convenient corridor for criminal activities.

Recommendation 12.4.2: Retain while improving the appearance of the alley barriers on the east and west sides of Indianola Avenue north of 5th Avenue to control access for illegal activities.

Recommendation 12.4.3: Examine street closures at 6th Street and 5th Avenue, 5th Street and 5th Avenue, and Hamlet Street and 5th Avenue to increase redevelopment potential while creating defensible neighborhoods along Weinland Park's southern perimeter.

Recommendation 12.4.4: Close the short section of Perry Street between West 8th and 9th Avenues to prevent commuter use of this predominately residential street. However, access for emergency vehicles must be retained.

Policy 12.5: Provide proper access and circulation for Ohio State and its related facilities and for businesses along the corridor (including service vehicle access).

Recommendation 12.5.1: Encourage and support the prompt widening of Lane Avenue west of High Street to provide two through lanes in each direction (plus turn lanes) and ensure that all traffic movements are installed and permitted at the Lane Avenue/High Street intersection.

Recommendation 12.5.2: Widen and improve Wall Alley from Lane Avenue to Northwood Avenue to provide two-way operation.

Recommendation 12.5.3: Widen and improve Pearl Street between East Woodruff Avenue and East 11th Avenue to provide an efficient service corridor.

Recommendation 12.5.4: Retain the existing street closures on the east side of High Street, and upgrade with public amenities as per recommendation 3.1.7.

Recommendation 12.5.6: Explore a direct connection of an improved two way East 11th Avenue to West 10th Avenue. Options should be explored as part of a larger redevelopment planning effort for the High Street area south 12th Avenue, North of East Nineth Avenue, and between Indianola and Michigan Street.

Recommendation 12.5.6: Relocate the existing traffic signal from the Chittenden Avenue/High Street intersection to the West 11th Avenue/High Street intersection. As an alternative, consider, directly connecting Chittenden to West 11th Avenues (eliminating the offset) with signalization provided as appropriate.

Recommendation 12.5.7: Improve traffic operations at the intersection of High Street with West and East Woodruff Avenues through traffic control modifications to provide proper access for the northern terminus of an improved Pearl Street. Any modification must recognize that Ohio State wishes to discourage through-traffic on West Woodruff Avenue and such plans should not be implemented until improvements are made to the Lane Avenue corridor.

Policy 12.6: Coordinate the access and circulation system with major pedestrian routes to provide safe pedestrian crossings.

Recommendation 12.6.1: Explore a new access route to Pearl Street at the existing traffic signal that serves the major Ohio State pedestrian corridor along the "old" West 17th Avenue alignment.

Recommendation 12.6.2: Provide pedestrian crossings of High Street only at signalized intersections.

Policy 12.7: Link the access and circulation system with parking facilities.

Recommendation 12.7.1: Install a traffic signal at 14th Avenue to provide safe pedestrian crossing and to accommodate vehicular access for the Ohio Union and adjacent parking structure(if there is not a detriment to the traffic system).

Policy 12.8: Improve access to Tuttle Park.

Recommendation 12.8.1: Explore conversion of Patterson Avenue, west of High Street, to two-way operation.

Recommendation 12.8.2: Explore expansion of Patterson Avenue into Tuttle Park.

Recommendation 12.8.3: Relocate the traffic signal being removed at the intersection of Neil Avenue and Oakland Avenue to the Patterson/Neil intersection (if the signal warrants are satisfied and there is not a detriment to the traffic system) to provide safe vehicular and pedestrian access for Tuttle Park.

Recommendation 12.8.4: Provide bicycle access along Patterson Avenue to Tuttle Park consistent with Bikeways and Open Space plans.

Policy 12.9 The alleys within the University District provide a valuable resource to support trash collection and off-street parking access. Their functionality should be improved, but their role as a major part of the community circulation system should be diminished.

Recommendation 12.9.1: Develop a strategy for evaluating, prioritizing and implementing upgrading of alleys within the East, North and South Campus Neighborhoods. Intent should be to provide consolidation of parking and increase trash capacity through a comprehensive redevelopment of all exterior space within the alley corridor (building rear to building rear).

Recommendation 12.9.2: Prioritize improvements to other alleys in other neighborhoods, seeking to upgrade paving and lighting only to the extent that it supports functional use of the alleys as a functional asset to the adjoining houses. Upgrades that improve the alleys to the point that cut through traffic is increased (i.e. significantly better paving) should be avoided.

Recommendation 12.9.3: In some areas examine speed bumps and stop signs on the alleys at street intersections to deter current high speed traffic moving through alleys.

C. Setting and Current Issues

The analysis of transportation conditions for the University Neighborhoods area has considered all modes: access and circulation, parking, public transportation, and non-motorized modes. The Ohio State University campus is a very large generator of transportation demand and affects the surrounding area in many ways. The study area includes a substantial residential area plus commercial corridors along High Street and Lane Avenue. All these elements define, impact, and require transportation service.

The major challenge is to balance these needs. This balance requires management of fixed resources, principally the public rights-of-way, plus strategies to promote greater use of transit and non-motorized modes. However, it is recognized that market conditions of certain components of the Plan for the area will require investment in additional parking supply and good-quality access.

The transportation system serving the University Neighborhoods has the following elements:

- Vehicle access and circulation
- Goods delivery, maintenance, and servicing
- Transit (Chapter 13)
- Bicycle and pedestrian (Chapter 13)

- Parking (Chapter 14)

The following statements list major problems and issues related to transportation and parking:

- The transportation system and traveler response is auto-dominated, with a resulting high demand for parking space.
- There is extreme competition for parking space in areas around the campus edge, where land resources are limited.
- Transit is relatively ineffective in terms of Ohio State or regional travel. COTA's ability to improve service is constrained; however, if the agency can obtain more funding, opportunities for better use may increase.
- Maintaining current levels of parking supply may cause problems to escalate such that people may decide to use other modes or park outside the area. That is the problem may evolve to an equilibrium condition. However, two situations must be considered: if parking is not added, development potentials along the commercial corridors may suffer; on the other hand if additional parking spaces are provided, they may encourage additional auto trips and continue to aggravate the existing traffic problems.
- The residential parking permit system appears to achieve the desired protection of the local parking supply; however, its application is not uniform. Current policies allow for changes in the system that can lead to an unstable parking situation.
- Transportation impacts on quality of life within the University District are due in part to Ohio State and commercial land-uses. The reverse is also true in that the needs of the residential areas place constraints on commercial areas, which may cause the commercial areas to be less successful and result in marginal uses that, in turn, negatively impacts the District (a never-ending cycle).
- The deteriorating condition and social structure in the southeast sector of the study area invites criminals and illegal/improper behavior. The role of Chittenden and 11th Avenues as arterials is having negative impacts by upsetting the normal functions of this neighborhood. In addition, discontinuities exist at High Street diminishing accessibility to the southern portion of the university and medical center complex.
- The impact of High Street and the Summit Street/Fourth Street one-way pair is to define subregional travel corridors through the area. This creates conflicts between the need for accessibility in the study area and efficient through movement.
- Many of the streets have a narrow right-of-way and narrow pavement (less than 30 feet), which creates conflicts between parked cars and moving traffic. Ultimately, the slow speed induced by a great deal of curb parking may be the solution to through-traffic penetration of the District.
- One-way traffic operations can be confusing, especially to visitors, and around-the-block circulation can be limited. However, the one-way operations on local residential streets permits more on-street parking and the inconvenience of one-way operation deters through-traffic and can be viewed as a strategy to protect the Neighborhoods.
- The access control/management concept along the High Street Corridor must be improved. Traffic signal placement, the location of local intersections, pedestrian crossings, bikeway crossings, and access to commercial parking need to be examined to achieve the optimal relationship with land-use/development concepts. The High Street commercial district has both a local and subregional trade area; therefore, parking and access need to be more direct from regional access routes. Proper service vehicle access must also be provided for existing and new businesses.
- With the advent of the new Ohio State arena, the relocation of certain events to St. John Arena, the construction of the new College of Business, and other developments along the Lane Avenue corridor (particularly near Tuttle Park Place), parking supply and control measures will need to be addressed to yield an effective parking system.

From a functional perspective, the existing street system has four parts:

- **Regional Accessibility.** Primary regional access is available via I-71 and SR 315. Other access is provided by US Route 23 (from the north via Indianola Avenue), High Street, and 5th Avenue. The key linkages are provided at interchanges along the two freeways, including I-71 at Hudson Street, 17th Avenue, and 11th Avenue, and SR 315 at Ackerman Road/Dodridge Street, Lane Avenue, and 5th Avenue.

- **Arterial Streets.** Within the area, there are several north-south arterial streets including High Street, Summit Street, Neil Avenue south of the campus, and Fourth Street. In the east-west direction there are Dodridge Street, Hudson Street, Lane Avenue, Chittenden Avenue (east of High Street), 11th Avenue (east of High Street), and 5th Avenue.
- **Major Collector Streets.** Within the area, there are a few major collector streets which supplement the arterial street system and provide access to subsections of the area. These include Neil Avenue north of the campus, Indianola Avenue (south of Hudson Street), 17th Avenue (east of Summit Street), 15th Avenue (west of Fourth Street), Woodruff Avenue/Woody Hayes Drive, and 10th and 11th Avenues (west of High Street).
- **Local Streets.** The remaining portion of the access and circulation system is the local streets, which are organized in a grid configuration that is relatively uniform in most of the area. Some discontinuities exist in four locations: (1) in the north-central zone of the study area, the orientation of the street system changes, forming some odd-shaped blocks and interrupting the pattern between High Street and Indianola Avenue north of Patterson Avenue; (2) the Iuka Ravine interrupts the pattern from High Street east in the area north of 16th Avenue; (3) along Summit Street, the continuity of east-west streets results in a series of "jog" and offset intersections north of 14th Avenue; and (4) along High Street there is a general discontinuity for most east-west streets, creating jog or offset intersections.

These discontinuities along the two major arterials are both an advantage and disadvantage. The advantage is that the offset helps local streets preserve a local function (i.e., the streets are less attractive as through routes). On the other hand, traffic operations along the two arterials are made somewhat more difficult because of the jogs, which cause short spacing between intersections, make placement of signals more difficult, and cause overlapping left turn movements.

Closely allied with the function and pattern of streets are street operations in terms of one-way traffic flow. The use of one-way streets has its basis in concern for parking space and traffic capacity/operations. For most of the local one-way streets, the presence of narrow streets (two- or three-lane-equivalent pavement width) has forced the decision to use one-way operation to allow for one or two lanes of on-street parking while preserving access and circulation. Along Summit/Fourth Streets and Chittenden/11th Avenues, as two sets of one-way couplets, one-way operation has allowed provision of the lanes needed to achieve traffic capacity while still retaining on-street parking.

Goods movement is a significant requirement for the High Street commercial area. High Street land uses are served by alleys, especially Pearl Street, with some on-street loading from High Street and intersecting east-west streets. Truck access is difficult in many cases given the limited space along the alleys and the significant competition with parked cars for space. With limited service vehicle access via the alley system, many businesses rely on service from High Street; however, the currently designated allowable loading/unloading times severely restrict service vehicle activities for some businesses. A more efficient service vehicle access system is required for the commercial districts.

D. Programs and Concepts

The Thoroughfare Plan of the Columbus Comprehensive Plan designates the functional classification of roads to serve as a tool for local officials to help develop an orderly and efficient roadway system. The city of Columbus further describes roadways by design elements within the functional classification system. To achieve the circulation hierarchy presented in this plan, the following revisions to the City of Columbus Thoroughfare Plan, need to be taken:

- Change Hudson Street from a Type 4-2 Arterial to a Collector between High Street and Indianola Avenue and extend this designation westward to Neil Avenue.
- Add Neil Avenue between Lane Avenue and Dodridge Street as a Collector.
- Delete Chittenden Avenue and make West 10th Avenue/East 11th Avenue a Collector.
- Change Neil Avenue, between Fifth Avenue and King Avenue, from a Type 4-2 Arterial to a Collector and extend this designation on Neil Avenue to West 10th Avenue.
- Change King Avenue from a Type 4-2 Arterial to a Collector and extend this designation, via East 7th Avenue, to Summit Street.

- Add East Woodruff Avenue (between High Street and Indianola Avenue), Indianola Avenue (between Woodruff Avenue and 12th Avenue), and East 12th Avenue (between High Street and Indianola Avenue) as Collectors.
- Add East 15th Avenue, from High Street to Fourth Street, as a Collector.

These proposed modifications will have to be reviewed and approved by the city of Columbus Traffic Engineering and Parking Division, Traffic and Transportation Commission, and Development Commission for recommendation of adoption by the City Council.

Summit and Fourth: One of the most controversial issues raised during the planning process was the treatment of the Summit Street/Fourth Street corridor. In the early stages of the planning process, a concept plan was developed that designated Summit Street as a single major arterial with Fourth Street downgraded to a collector status. This permitted the identification of discernible neighborhoods and permitted adherence to the goals of the functional classification system of roadways as presented earlier.

However, to accomplish this concept plan, significant roadway improvements would be required, including modifications at Hudson Street, widening of Summit Street south of 11th Avenue, and construction of a cross-over between Summit and Fourth Streets (perhaps north of 5th Avenue) to properly marry with the Third and Fourth Street one-way couplet in downtown Columbus at I-670. Such a system would also require the restriction of parking on Summit Street at all times.

The feasibility of implementing two-way operations on Summit and Fourth Streets was fully investigated as part of the planning process. Given regional travel demands and the physical constraints of providing proper roadway connections on the north and south ends of the corridor, it was concluded that it is not feasible to gain two-way operations while, at the same time, yielding a residential character to the streets. Beyond this, many residents within the corridor preferred the retention of one-way operations for traffic impact (i.e., experience peak traffic flows in either the morning or afternoon hours, but not both), safety for pedestrian crossing movements, and the ability to park on the streets.

For the above reasons, it is recommended that the one-way operations of Summit and Fourth Streets be retained *at this time*. However, it is further recommended that the current peak hour parking restrictions be eliminated and that landscaped neckdowns be constructed to narrow the physical width of the pavements--primarily at crosswalks. (The placement of these neckdowns must be carefully considered so as not to interfere with left or right turning movements that must be maintained at key cross-street intersections.) This concept is compatible with possible future two-way operations on Summit and Fourth Streets; however, it is unrealistic to pursue this change until there are major alterations in travel modes, patterns, and/or volumes within the region.

11th and High: Another item requiring further discussion is the recommendation to create East 11th Avenue as a single major collector and connecting it with West 10th Avenue at High Street. (This system would replace the one-way couplet of Chittenden and East 11th Avenues which marry with West 10th and 11th Avenues via off-set intersections at High Street.) There are many reasons for the recommended single two-way corridor, including: (1) with East 11th Avenue connecting with I-71 and passing under the Conrail Tracks it provides a continuous access route to High Street, Neil Avenue, and the Ohio State medical center complex, (2) it eliminates having to route westbound traffic to Chittenden Avenue, (3) it eliminates the impacts on land uses caused by a one-way pair through traffic, (4) East 11th Avenue becomes a logical break between neighborhoods, and (5) off-set intersections are eliminated.

The alignment and configuration of the West 10th Avenue/East 11th Avenue collector will be defined as part of the planning efforts for new developments in the area. Commensurate with the proposed realignment, it is recommended that two-way operations be installed on West 11th Avenue. As an option, it may also be desirable to connect West 11th Avenue directly with Chittenden Avenue. Clearly, more detailed traffic engineering studies will be required when plans are prepared for new developments in the zone. In addition, these planning efforts will have to address the issue related to the removal of on-street parking (as required for the conversion of the streets to two-way operations).

High Street Corridor

Pearl Street: The role of Pearl Street, in conjunction with High Street, is to support existing and future development. To achieve this goal, the Plan recommends a major reconstruction of Pearl Street (see also Chapter 15.0). Only when Pearl Street can operate efficiently as the service corridor will High Street be able to attract the mix of tenants and users required for its renaissance.

The long-term goal should be to widen Pearl Street, from Woodruff Avenue to East 11th Avenue, to provide two-way operation with a minimum pavement width of 24 feet. Wherever possible, Pearl Street should be widened to at least 36 feet to provide service vehicle loading zones along the west side and metered parking on the east side. These Street widenings should be accomplished through the acquisition of land parcels on the east side of Pearl Street. The acquisition should be of sufficient depth to permit the construction of sidewalks, the installation of landscaping, and the consolidation of utilities along the east side of Pearl Street. However, at all intersections with east - west streets, this width should be necked down to avoid creating a desolate band of paving between High Street commercial and the residential areas.

Primary emphasis should be placed upon the widening of Pearl Street south of 15th Avenue to East 11th Avenue. In the zone north of 15th Avenue, property acquisitions may be difficult or limited right of way constrained by significant existing structures may limit improvements to a 24 foot cross-section or less.

High Street and Lane Avenue: The recommended improvements at the intersection of High Street with Lane Avenue cannot occur until the Lane Avenue corridor is improved. At present, the city of Columbus is undertaking feasibility studies for widening and improving Lane Avenue west of High Street. In general, the improvements will include widening of Lane Avenue to provide two lanes in each direction plus turn lanes. The recommended improvements shown in the following figure are compatible with these plans. Beyond improving the traffic carrying capacity of Lane Avenue west of High Street to SR 315, the construction of a northbound left turn lane on High Street is essential--a movement not currently permitted, thus causing traffic to use West Woodruff Avenue through the Ohio State campus or West Norwich Avenue to access westbound Lane Avenue. Beyond this, eastbound and westbound left turn movements from Lane Avenue to High Street are currently precluded, thus causing circuitous movements and unwelcome use of other streets in the area. Given the currently envisioned funding sources for the planned Lane Avenue corridor improvements and the inherent study/design/review processes, it is unlikely that Lane Avenue can be improved prior to year 2000.

13.0 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

A. Objectives

Alternatives to automobile circulation with the Neighborhoods are largely relegated to infrequent bus service, limited Ohio State University shuttle services, and informal use of bicycles on streets without designated bike lanes. To reduce automobile dependence and demand for parking spaces in the Neighborhoods, the Revitalization Plan has identified policies and recommendations for improving alternative transportation methods.

The following objectives define the transportation issues and frame the discussion which follows:

Objective 1: Provide a more effective public transportation/transit system.

Objective 1: Enhance and improve pedestrian movement within the area.

Objective 2: Enhance and improve bicycle movement to, from, and within the University Neighborhoods.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Transit

Policy 13.1: Enhance and improve the COTA bus service to encourage non-automobile travel to, from, and within the Ohio State area and its adjacent Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 13.1.1: Enhance High Street as a major transit corridor to and through the area by improving bus stops and patron facilities.

Recommendation 13.1.2: Develop Lane Avenue as a major east-west transit corridor from the west to High Street once Lane is widened and improved.

Recommendation 13.1.3: Encourage and support COTA in endeavors to establish Ohio State as one of the major transit centers in the metropolitan area.

Policy 13.2: Enhance and improve Ohio State's shuttle system to encourage non-automobile travel and to facilitate connections between Ohio State activity nodes and the East, north and South Campus Neighborhoods..

Recommendation 13.2.1: Expand Ohio State's shuttle bus system along High Street and into the Neighborhoods at minimal cost to users, and encourage usage by students, staff, faculty, and residents circulating within the Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 13.2.2: Expansion of the Ohio State shuttle service should reinforce land use objectives by focusing service on Mixed Use Areas (see Chapter 5).

Recommendation 13.2.3: Maintain high levels of Ohio State shuttle services to and from the parking lots in the West Campus areas for commuters and off-campus resident students needing storage parking.

Recommendation 13.2.4: Coordinate COTA's bus service on High Street, Lane Avenue, West 10th/East 11th Avenues with the Ohio State transit/shuttle services.

Pedestrian/Bicycle

Policy 13.3: Coordinate major on- and off-campus pedestrian routes and provide safe pedestrian crossings of roadways.

Recommendation 13.3.1: Establish pedestrian crossing points of High Street at signalized intersections (Woodruff Avenue, West 18th Avenue, West 17th Avenue, 15th Avenue, 14th Avenue, 13th Avenue, 12th Avenue, and West 11th Avenue) which relate to the major pedestrian corridors of the Ohio State campus.

Recommendation 13.3.2: Remove other existing mid-block crosswalks and add one at Frambes Avenue to address possible safety concerns.

Policy 13.4: Establish a system of bicycle routes through the area and connect the Ohio State and Neighborhoods bicycle route system with the City-wide bicycle system.

Recommendation 13.4.1: Engage the City's bicycle coordinator to address and develop the bike plan for the area in concert with appropriate representatives of Ohio State.

Recommendation 13.4.2: Additional bicycle parking should be provided both on and off campus. Consider bicycle lockers for long-term and commuter parking.

Recommendation 13.4.3: Enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety via a bicyclist education and enforcement program.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Two forms of public transportation (transit) exists in the study area: bus service provided by the Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA) and shuttles operated by Ohio State. The principal COTA service is provided along High Street and along the Summit Street/Fourth Street corridor. Other routes cross or circulate in the area via the Dodridge/Hudson Street corridor; West Woodruff Avenue/Woody Hayes Drive; Chittenden Avenue and East 11th Avenue; King Avenue, West 9th Avenue, West 12th Avenue, West 10th Avenue, Neil Avenue, and 5th Avenue. The dominant ridership patterns are along the High Street Corridor (i.e., along the High Street Corridor to and from downtown Columbus). The east-west routes are not used as heavily.

The Ohio State transit system is primarily configured to serve internal travel within the campus. Significant routes are along West Woodruff Avenue/Woody Hayes Drive, 12th Avenue, Neil Avenue, West 9th Avenue (west of Neil Avenue), and Cannon Drive. The Ohio State transit systems serves the West Campus and its parking areas. The bus service operates on headways of less than ten minutes and is reasonably direct; however, the system's potential is only partially utilized. In addition, Ohio State has terminated much of its bus service east of High Street due to a lack of patronage.

The proximity of off-campus student residential areas to the campus produces significant pedestrian and bicycle activity in the High Street Corridor. A number of marked crosswalks are provided to cross High Street. Eight of these are located at signalized intersections from Lane Avenue to Chittenden Avenue. However, there are three other crosswalks at intersections or at mid-block locations that function without the aid of a signal. High Street has two lanes in each direction plus a center lane used intermittently for left turns. This center lane also functions as a refuge area for pedestrians crossing the street. The situation has the potential to be unsafe; however, recent accident experience does not indicate that a significant problem exists.

Bikeways exist within the Ohio State campus and there is a narrow marked bikeway on the east side (northbound) of High Street in the campus area. Bikeways do not exist elsewhere in the study area; however, the city of Columbus is in the process of defining bicycle routes to and through the study area. To delineate exclusive bikeways raises a pavement-use trade-off; that is, because of narrow pavement widths, a parking lane or traffic lane would need to be eliminated if on-street bike lanes are established. However, the use of bicycles in a student residential environment would be a positive situation.

D. Programs and Concepts

Figure 3: Transit Routes (*not available in Internet Version*) illustrates a possible route structure for the COTA and Ohio State University bus services. The goal is to significantly improve the quality, distribution, and frequency of transit service for students, staff, and faculty of Ohio State as well as for residents of the Neighborhoods. In addition, improvements should entail high quality stops (shelters) with user amenities--coordinated with pedestrianways and land uses.

Figure 4: Bikeway Routes (*not available in Internet Version*), illustrates the planning team's recommendations for an integrated bikeway system throughout the neighborhoods. The bicycle coordinator for the city of Columbus is currently developing a comprehensive bike route plan. Alternatives being considered include designated north-south bike routes along the Summit/Fourth Street corridor and along the Neil Avenue/17th Avenue/Tuttle Park Place corridor. Possible east-west corridors include Patterson Avenue and Arcadia Avenue (linked with Calumet Street and Pacemont Road).

The Ohio State Campus Master Plan also designates a bicycle circulation system with the following primary points of access from the adjacent neighborhoods: Neil Avenue from the north and south, East Woodruff Avenue at High Street, old West 17th Avenue at High Street, and West 12th Avenue at High Street. The Master Plan states that a bicycling network should be designated to connect key destinations on the campus and to link to destinations off campus, including regional bicycle paths along the river.

Given the bicycle circulation system presented in the Ohio State Master Plan, it is recommended that the neighborhoods' primary bicycle route be designated along East Woodruff Avenue and East 12th Avenue--connected via a link along Indianola Avenue. To link this system with the City-wide system, it is recommended

that the overall plan be developed by the City's bicycle coordinator. This person could also address other issues related to the use of bicycles including parking, safety, and enforcement programs.

14.0 PARKING

A. Objectives

The resolution of parking issues within the Neighborhoods and the High Street Corridor is addressed in this chapter. During the months when school is in session, there is intense competition for parking in the Neighborhoods. The rejuvenation of the High Street Corridor depends on an adequate parking supply close to the retailers and other businesses. The following three objectives define the discussion in this chapter:

Objective 1: Define and establish a parking program for the residential areas within the District.

Objective 2: Define and establish a parking program for the commercial district along the High Street Corridor.

Objective 3: Define and establish a parking program for the commercial and residential district along the Lane Avenue corridor.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 14.1: Define parking needs by neighborhood and block; provide on- and off-street parking space needs based on the current Overlay Zoning Code.

Recommendation 14.1.1: Prioritize localized parking needs by user groups (including: residents, visitors, business patrons, and employees) and coordinate with land use and development.

Policy 14.2: Encourage students to warehouse their vehicles in long term parking facilities where available, by improving security and offering economic incentives.

Recommendation 14.2.1: Use alleys and rear yards for consolidation into more efficient and better-regulated off-street parking lots; reprioritize use of parking, with off-street expansion for student residential areas.

Recommendation 14.2.2: Acquire problem properties for limited conversion to "pocket parking lots" (using design standards to minimize their visual impact); use "area-service" principle and develop economical parking reservoirs in the middle of blocks with dense housing.

Policy 14.3: Control/eliminate commuter parking in the residential areas.

Recommendation 14.3.1: Introduce an aggressive parking permit system with limitations on auto use, relate housing density to auto ownership and parking needs, and institute the following:

- A tightly managed parking permit system for most streets within the East Campus area coordinated with incentives to use West Campus parking.
- A 24-hour resident-only parking permit system in a collar-zone surrounding the East Campus area.
- A parking permit program for all other areas of the University Neighborhoods (as requested by each neighborhood) effective 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with up to two-hour parking allowed without a permit.

Policy 14.4: Provide parking facilities for businesses in accordance with patron and employee needs; define operations and enforcement to control use by others.

Recommendation 14.4.1: Construct new off-street parking lots along Pearl Street on residual land acquired for the widening and improvement of Pearl Street; these lots should be controlled with short-term parking meters

Recommendation 14.4.2: Work with Ohio State to improve the marketing and use of existing and future Ohio State parking facilities to support the Lane Avenue commercial corridor.

Recommendation 14.4.3: Assist businesses in the development of a parking control and enforcement program to protect patron and employee parking areas from unauthorized use.

Recommendation 14.4.4: Assure the parking requirements are maintained during the review process to require the following parking space for new developments: 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail space, and 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of office space.

Policy 14.5: Devote on-street parking to short-term use in the zones serving the High Street commercial area.

Recommendation 14.5.1: Install short-term parking meters on High Street north of Norwich Avenue to Blake Avenue; restrict usage on the west side during the a.m. peak commuter hours and on the east side during the p.m. peak hour.

Recommendation 14.5.2: Provide short-term parking meters on the north side of 15th Avenue, generally between Pearl Street and Indianola Avenue, with operations 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Recommendation 14.5.3: Provide short-term meters in the parking areas west of Pearl Street and on streets east of Pearl Street (from Chittenden Avenue to Woodruff Avenue) for a minimum distance of approximately 200 feet with hours of operation from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. where a surplus of on street parking exists, explore extension of meters further to the east up to 400 feet. Consideration should be given to the removal of the meters east of Pearl Street when off-street parking facilities are developed in the area.

Recommendation 14.5.4: Allow curb parking along the east side of High Street (where parking does not interfere with bus stop and traffic operation), between East 11th Avenue and Lane Avenue, from 7:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.

Policy 14.6: Expand the off-street parking supply through a combination of new parking structures and improved marketing of Ohio State parking garages.

Recommendation 14.6.1: Develop a Parking Benefits District that captures meter revenue, fines and permit fees generated within the District. Dedicate these monies to improving the supply, quality and affordability of parking within the District.

Recommendation 14.6.2: Work with Ohio State to improve the marketing and use of existing Ohio State parking facilities to support the High Street commercial corridor. This could be accomplished by permitting High Street businesses to purchase parking spaces as available for their employees, and by developing more user friendly signage for the garages, and by instituting a fee structure for off-peak use by the public. For evening purposes, coordinated use of this inventory would be a major asset. Certain major campus events would require reservation of this supply; however, this could be coordinated with proper communication to High Street patrons.

Recommendation 14.6.3: Construct a parking structure near 17th Avenue along Pearl Street with direct access to High Street to provide parking for High Street employees and patrons.

Recommendation 14.6.4: Construct parking structures as part of the redevelopment nodes near 11th Avenue, 15th Avenue, and Lane Avenue. Assure their design is not intrusive to the neighborhoods, and special attention is given to massing, lighting, ground floor uses, and materials.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Parking may be the dominant transportation-related issue the University Neighborhoods faces. The parking impact of the Ohio State population in the Neighborhoods, the parking needs of residents (especially considering increased auto ownership in the area), and the parking needs of the High Street and Lane Avenue commercial corridors combine to escalate the issue of parking.

Ohio State provides parking for faculty, staff, students, and visitors. Two major parking garages are located along High Street (one north of Arps Hall near 18th Avenue and one north of the Ohio Union at 14th Avenue). These two garages are fee-parking facilities available for public use and have the potential to support High Street land uses.

Other campus parking facilities are located within the campus (with controlled access roads), on the northern and southern edges of the campus, and west of the Olentangy River. The West Campus parking spaces are currently underutilized. These spaces are available for student parking, either for commuting students or for local area resident students who need storage (or warehouse) parking. Ohio State has attempted to attract student parkers to these facilities as a means to remove student vehicles from neighborhood parking and prevent the inevitable conflict (competition) for parking space on residential streets.

In the area surrounding the Ohio State campus (i.e., a zone generally bound by Patterson Avenue on the north, Fourth Street on the east, and West 5th and East 8th Avenues on the south) there are approximately 16,300 parking spaces--excluding Ohio State parking facilities. Of these, 4,900 spaces are located on-street and 11,400 spaces are located in off-street facilities. Parking conditions within this study area are highly variable as verified by surveys conducted in March, April, and May of 1995. Data was collected for weekday, weekend day, daytime, and evening conditions.

Key findings from these parking surveys are as follows:

- On a day when Ohio State classes were in session, early morning parking occupancy was 10,900 spaces, with 79 percent of on-street spaces and 62 percent of off-street spaces occupied. This demand level reflects the presence of residents (permanent, transient, and student).
- By mid-morning, occupancy dropped to 9,700 spaces. On-street space use stayed at the same level, but off-street space use fell to 52 percent. This condition reflected the departure of residents (likely commuting to jobs elsewhere). The lack of increased use in on-street parking indicates the impact of the residential parking permit program. This program inhibits the inflow of commuter vehicles to neighborhood streets; however, some of this still occurs because all streets do not have permit regulation.
- The amount of vacant parking space might indicate that there are no major parking problems. However, half of the sub-areas exhibit very high (over 90 percent) occupancy levels for on-street spaces. These zones are located north and east of the Ohio State campus and, practically speaking, no on-street space is available in these areas.
- Overall, the off-street system exhibits a high degree of vacancy. One of the factors influencing this situation is that most off-street parking is private. Its use is restricted to tenants, owners, renters, or customers. Such parking is not available (legally) for public use, including use by commuters. The vast majority of off-street parking (88 percent or 10,000 spaces) is residential-related. These spaces include many informal (unmarked) parking lots located in the blocks close to the campus. Some of this capacity is not practical nor convenient to use and, therefore, may represent an overestimate of the off-street resources.
- Data collected during the week of Ohio State's spring vacation indicated that the overall parking demand decreased by 4,200 spaces. This decrease represents the vehicles of students and some staff who were absent during the vacation week. Thus, it is estimated that the base parking demand (no normal Ohio State impact) is 5,500 spaces during the midday. During the overnight hours, the demand is 6,500 spaces, reflecting permanent residential demand.
- Along the High Street Corridor between 5th Avenue and Blake Avenue the total parking supply (on- and off-street) is 1,530 spaces (between the alleys paralleling High Street on the east and west sides; exclusive of parking at Ohio State). Occupancy in early and late evening, when this supply is most heavily used, amounts to over 90 percent in two sections: north of Lane Avenue and from 11th to 15th Avenues. Other sections exhibit high occupancy only in the early evening.
- The existing High Street commercial parking supply is not only limited in the number of spaces that are available; there is also limited access to and from High Street. The existing series of alternating one-way east-west streets, the cul-de-sacs on several intermediate streets east of High Street, the lack of continuous alley access from Pearl Street, and the one-way sections of Pearl Street all lend to the limited accessibility of many of the existing commercial parking facilities. Many parking areas require the driver to circulate through the adjacent residential neighborhood to access the commercial

parking. This includes the on-street parking located at the cul-de-sacs. Few of the off-street facilities in the High Street Corridor have direct access to High Street. Most only have access from the alley or from the terminated east-west streets. This makes access to the commercial parking areas difficult for those unfamiliar with the area.

- Surveys of business establishments along High Street revealed that many suffer from lack of convenient, nearby parking and from poor service-vehicle access. Many indicated a loss of trade (such as lunch-hour patronage or regional customers) as a direct result of the lack of parking. Another concern was the lack of affordable parking for employees, many of whom earn near minimum wage.
- Business establishments along Lane Avenue, near Tuttle Park Place, also identified lack and control of parking as an issue. Some desire a working relationship with Ohio State for use of campus parking spaces when not needed by Ohio State. Others fear that new developments in the area, together with parking demands generated by Ohio State events, will cause excessive parking demands in the area forcing existing businesses to place complex control systems on their private lots to ensure parking spaces for their customers and visitors.
- A special aspect of the overall parking system is the current residential parking permit program. This program applies to various streets around the edge of campus with 11 established permit zones. Permits are in effect during the daytime hours from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., or 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Residents within these zones can secure permits upon request with a fee of \$25.00.

D. Programs and Concepts

The goal in developing the parking element of the Revitalization Plan was to balance the need for adequate parking to support both commercial and residential uses with the need for adequate and efficient vehicular circulation. The parking program needs to consider both existing land uses and future development in the area and to recognize the inherent relationship of transportation, especially parking, to land-use development.

In choosing alternatives to be recommended for the parking plan, each alternative was evaluated in the context of: (1) how it fit into an overall system for the area, and (2) to what extent the alternative satisfied the specific needs identified for each neighborhood and the overall study area. A recommended program was developed that reflects a basic strategy to best manage the scarce parking resources by addressing two principal elements:

- Protection of residential parking resources through control of parking demand (especially commuter students) and creation of parking resources for off-campus student residents in the University Neighborhoods to enhance parking opportunities and attract students to this area.
- Provision of patron short-term and evening parking resources to support the commercial corridor.

The first element reflects several criteria that each alternative was evaluated against. These included the alternative's ability to increase the number of available parking spaces for residents through increasing the overall parking supply or reallocating existing parking spaces by restricting their use to residents only. This protection, however, must be achieved without reducing the number of available commercial parking spaces. The protection of parking also must not become a hardship to the residents. The resident survey indicated a reluctance to add controls to the parking in their neighborhood. This is due to the cost and inconvenience of acquiring a parking permit for themselves and for guests. Finally, the concept must address the problems on a wide scale and must not provide a solution for one neighborhood at the expense of another.

The second element reflects the need to address the existing parking shortage in the commercial areas and the need for more parking if additional commercial uses are developed along Lane Avenue and High Street. With several changes proposed to the street system in the overall study area to improve access and circulation on the street system, improved access to the parking system must also be developed. Alternatives were evaluated as to how they would increase the amount of commercial parking and the supply of evening parking. They were also evaluated with regard to how they would improve access and circulation to commercial parking facilities. The alternatives that provide the best overall improvement to the parking conditions became part of the final recommendations.

The translation of a parking strategy into a series of actions resulted in the following suggested initiating programs:

Protection of Residential Parking Resources: The first element is the consolidation and reorganization of residential off-street parking in key residential blocks. The alleys and parking areas along the alleys of some key residential blocks should be consolidated to create more efficient central parking areas.

- One situation that would be a candidate for this type of conversion would be blocks where adjacent on-street parking would be removed to provide additional traffic lanes or to convert one-way streets to two-way operation. In this scenario, off-street parking spaces would be developed behind the residences to replace lost on-street spaces. These spaces would likely need to be controlled by parking permits. Candidates for this type of parking conversion could include blocks along East 11th Avenue, West 10th Avenue, and selected blocks along East Woodruff, Indianola, and East 12th Avenues.
- A second situation would be to replace on-street permit parking with open parking and provide the permit spaces off the adjacent alley. The on-street parking would accommodate visitor and short-term parking needs, while the alley spaces would accommodate the long-term resident parking needs.
- A third situation would be blocks with high-density residential development that could make more efficient use of limited space by sharing parking facilities. In those blocks, parking would be allocated to adjacent buildings on a unit basis, with unused parking from one building being used by another building that has more vehicles. Candidate blocks for this type of treatment include blocks in the East Campus Neighborhood.

Area A would cover the East Campus generally bound by Pearl Street on the west, the alley north of East Woodruff Avenue on the north, Summit Street on the east, and the east-west alley between East 11th and Chittendon Avenues on the south. Within this area, there would be a mixture of parking control strategies, including: (1) open parking (i.e., no controls) particularly in the fraternity and sorority areas; (2) parking permits for the established "J," "R," and "S" zones; and (3) short-term parking meters. The parking meters should have one-hour time limits. Those along East 15th Avenue should have 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. operations, while those on east-west streets east of Pearl Street should have 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. operations. The residential permit areas should be designated 24-hour permit parking only zones.

Area B would be the transition from Area A and would be restricted to 24-hour permit (resident and visitor) parking only. There are three sub-areas making up Area B. The northern sub-area would be north of Area A and extend to (and include) Oakland Avenue, with an eastern boundary at Fourth Street. The eastern sub area would be east of Area A, with basically 20th and 11th Avenues as the northern and southern limits. The southern sub area would basically be south of the Ohio State campus to West 8th Avenue between Neil Avenue and High Street.

Area C would be permit parking areas north, east, and south of Areas A and B. These permit areas would be effective 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with up to two hours of parking allowed without a permit. To be effective until 6:00 p.m., the signage will have to be posted with an 8:00 p.m. cut-off time.

The boundaries of permit areas should be established by the City, basically along planning area boundaries, to reduce the administrative problems with the current permit system by eliminating the petition process.

With the expansion of the permit areas, more permits will be sold. As such, it would be appropriate to reduce the cost of each permit. The cost of the permits should be set to cover the administrative costs of the program. Appropriate ordinances would have to be approved to accomplish this.

The parking permit process also requires some special attention to eliminate misuse of the system. The current process allows automatic renewal by mail which is not particularly practical in the East, South and North Campus Neighborhoods where the student population changes annually. Also, there appears to be some counterfeiting of permits. Better quality permits with easier license plate correlations probably are in order.

Parking to Support Commercial Areas: The primary commercial area lies along the High Street Corridor. Specific recommendations for this corridor include the following elements:

- The use of vacant spaces in the two Ohio State parking structures west of High Street would help support the High Street commercial area. The Arps Hall garage has approximately 900 parking spaces. It is fully occupied during the day on weekdays until 5:30 p.m., but after that time there are 450 to 550

spaces available. The Union garage has approximately 1,060 spaces. During the day there are usually 150 vacant spaces in the garage. In the evening after 5:30 p.m., approximately 500 parking spaces are available in the garage. A working relationship with Ohio State needs to be developed to improve the marketing and use of these facilities - including more user-friendly signage and reduced parking fees for off-peak usage.

- Beyond the use of the existing Ohio State facilities, additional parking will be required to fully support the redevelopment of the High Street Corridor. Parking structures should be constructed as a part of the development nodes near Lane and High and near 11th and High. Also, a parking structure should be considered somewhere near 15th Avenue--perhaps at 17th Avenue since an access road from High Street can be provided at this location.
- Short-term parking meters should be installed along the High Street and Pearl Street corridors to provide for patron parking. Consideration should also be given to allowing parking along the east side of High Street, between East 11th Avenue and Lane Avenue from 7:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., until additional off-street parking facilities are constructed in the corridor.
- While the number of parking spaces required by commercial land uses will vary depending upon the specific use, it is recommended that 3.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet be provided for retail uses. This yields approximately 1 space for employees per 1,000 square feet and 2 spaces for patrons per 1,000 square feet. These ratios recognize that approximately one-half of the retail employees come from within the area and do not drive (as a separate trip). They also recognize that approximately two-thirds of the retail patrons of many establishments come (or will come) from outside the area thus requiring a parking space. Based on a survey of businesses along the corridor, only a few (such as bookstores and some restaurants) rely predominantly on the built-in trade generated by Ohio State.
- The other commercial area lies along the Lane Avenue corridor. In the area near Tuttle Park Place, business owners and operators identified the lack and control of parking as an issue. Some desire a working relationship with Ohio State for use of campus parking spaces when not needed by Ohio State. Others fear that new developments in the area, together with parking demands generated by Ohio State events, will cause excessive parking demands in the area, forcing existing businesses to place complex control systems on their private lots to ensure parking spaces for their customers and visitors. Further studies and discussions are required to properly address these issues.

Parking Benefits District: The plan includes recommendations for off-street parking improvements in addition to improved management of on-street parking (short-term metered and permit parking). To implement such a program, it is desirable to use a "system-based" approach. This could take the form of a special benefit district.

Such a district could be established by the city of Columbus for the University Neighborhoods. The district would be responsible for all off-street and on-street parking. It would be administered by the City. The district would coordinate various sources of financial resources for a parking program such as meter income, permit fees from the area, rental/lease income, and parking fines. The concept is that all funds collected in the area would be spent on improvements to benefit the area-including subsidizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of off-street parking lots and parking structures in the area.

Core Value #5: The University District shall demonstrate new leadership and investment partnerships to reverse the decline in retail and housing.

Chapter 15.0 addresses the desirability of enhancing and maintaining a viable commercial district within the University Neighborhoods. The High Street Corridor and the other smaller local neighborhood commercial streets should provide the majority of the goods and services necessary for a thriving community. The intent of this chapter is to recognize successful existing businesses, and to create strategies that encourage new investment to reverse recent declines in commercial activity.

15.0 COMMERCIAL REVITALIZATION

A. Objectives

Vital, active, and diverse commercial uses are essential to attracting new residents to the University District. Current research has shown that residents will consider returning to urban neighborhoods if they are properly served by retail operations that offer day-to-day goods and services in a convenient, cost-competitive setting. Furthermore, communities are finding that neighborhood shopping streets that combine small, locally owned businesses with nationally recognized stores into active main streets serve as an amenity for new residents.

This section's purpose is to clarify the role of the High Street, Lane Avenue, 5th Avenue, and intermittent neighborhood commercial sites. The following policies and recommendations are put forth primarily to craft High Street into a diverse but cohesive commercial center that is both an amenity for the University District and a viable and healthy community attraction for Columbus at large. Successful realization of these recommendations will bring economic stability to the community, increase job opportunities, enhance the area's sense of pride, and increase the essential services and retail offerings of the community. All of these factors will clearly increase the attractiveness of the University District as a neighborhood of choice for students and permanent residents alike.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 15.1: Support physical and programmatic improvements that will lead to the revitalization of the High Street commercial district. Successful revitalization will be measured by increased economic activity and local sales dollar capture, improved diversity of retail and entertainment offerings, as well as retention and expansion of locally owned and operated businesses.

Recommendation 15.1.1: Support existing businesses and assist development of new locally owned businesses, while attracting new national caliber retailers to create a vital mix of unique retail offerings, cost competitive retailers, and retailers serving the diverse needs of the community.

Recommendation 15.1.2: Work with the Ohio State legislature to develop legislation to allow the city of Columbus to control distribution of liquor licenses within city boundaries. Establish a system within the city to control and limit distribution of new or renewed licenses, reducing the concentration of liquor licenses in the area and limit distribution of new or renewed licenses.

Recommendation 15.1.3: Create a Special Improvement District for the High Street Corridor (East 9th Avenue to Lane Avenue) to provide daily maintenance, improved safety, District-wide marketing and business support. Recommendation 15.1.4: Identify and market new and existing retail tenants around three distinct thematic centers (11th and High, 15th and High, Lane and High) to serve as anchors for High Street revitalization while focusing available retail demand.

Recommendation 15.1.5: Develop subsidized parking strategies at locations within easy walking distance of the three activity centers to ensure the success of concentrated retail venues. Explore Parking District as funding mechanism (see Chapter 14.0).

Recommendation 15.1.6: Develop Design Guidelines for Retail and Commercial Uses within the University District and High Street in particular. Administration of the Guidelines should be by the existing University Area Review Board.

Recommendation 15.1.7: Establish legislation and/or programs to solve blighting problems such as panhandling, graffiti and handbill pollution.

Recommendation 15.1.8: Encourage development and placement of readily accessible public toilets in the corridor.

Recommendation 15.1.9: Explore NCR designation for High Street between 7th Avenue and Lane Avenue.

Policy 15.2: Improve the physical appearance and character of the High Street Corridor to attract new retail activity, solve critical functional issues, and create an active and exciting neighborhood focus for the University District.

Recommendation 15.2.1: Encourage conservation and adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Where new building construction is required, ensure that design is compatible with the existing scale, texture, and character of the corridor.

Recommendation 15.2.2: New development for High Street should ensure a minimum sidewalk width of 15 feet.

Recommendation 15.2.3: Redevelop Pearl Street as the primary service corridor for High Street businesses, with a minimum width of 24 feet and a maximum width of 36 feet.

Recommendation 15.2.4: Upgrade the physical appearance of the High Street Corridor from 5th Avenue to Norwich Avenue with coordinated signage, lighting, street furnishings, and pavement systems.

Recommendation 15.2.5: Create new public plazas and open space at existing and proposed street closures, along High Street that allow for passive and active retail and community uses.

Policy 15.3: Guide the redevelopment of land uses adjoining West Lane Avenue to ensure it appropriately serves its role as the primary gateway corridor from the west into the University District.

Recommendation 15.3.1: Ensure that the proposed widening for Lane Avenue provides a minimum edge treatment of 8-foot wide tree lawn area and 8-foot wide sidewalks.

Recommendation 15.3.2: Develop incentives and development assistance to attract new residential and commercial development on Lane Avenue between Neil Avenue and Tuttle Park Place. In return for assistance, seek strict design standards that builds an enhanced street wall between Tuttle Park Place and 400 feet east of Neil Avenue.

Recommendation 15.3.3: Strengthen the gateway role of Lane Avenue with significant architectural treatment of structures that frame the intersection of Lane Avenue and Tuttle Park Place. Examine closing the Tuttle Park Place north of Lane as part of the corridor improvements.

Recommendation 15.3.4: The Ohio State University should assist in the corridors' redevelopment by offering creative parking solutions for new businesses, and building new facilities that create a street wall on the south side of Lane from Tuttle Park Place to Neil Avenue.

Policy 15.4: Support new commercial development along 5th Avenue from Grant Street to Hamlet Street that creates job opportunities and provides new goods and services for local residents.

Recommendation 15.4.1: Seek a location for a new business incubator facility. Explore the warehouse at the corner of 5th Avenue and Fourth Street.

Recommendation 15.4.2: Create new commercial development in the 5th Avenue corridor (east of Hamlet Street) by combining lots with defensible street closures at Sixth Street, Hamlet Street and Fifth Street.

Policy 15.5. Strengthen existing neighborhood retail and service centers throughout the University Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 15.5.1: Create financial incentives to redevelop the existing retail center on Fourth Street at 18th Avenue.

Recommendation 15.5.2: Facilitate the acquisition and exchange of public/private lands to create a new neighborhood center located between Fourth and Summit Streets on the north side of 11th Avenue. Ensure

that the proposed city of Columbus Division of Electricity substation is not detrimental to the redevelopment of this key parcel, and consider alternative sites such as the vacant parcel at 11th and the Conrail Tracks.

Recommendation 15.5.3: Support existing programs and funding to assist business owners renovate and improve corner commercial, retail, and restaurants throughout the District.

C. Setting and Current Issues

Commercial uses and retail operations within the University District fall into four major categories:

- High Street - comprised of two distinct zones, 5th Avenue to East 9th (a mixture of neighborhood commercial and community businesses); East 11th Avenue to Norwich (small users catering primarily to the student body).
- Lane Avenue
- 5th Avenue, primarily east of Hamlet Street
- Scattered neighborhood commercial sites, primarily carry-out or convenience type commercial

Currently, High Street, which is viewed as the primary retail opportunity and focus of the community, is in a stage of slow decline. An increasing number of storefronts are vacant, and the synergistic mix of retail uses that would provide vitality and complimentary market draw of shoppers is absent. The primary factors leading to the current decline include:

- A decline in the total number of students (the primary customer base for the area) living in the Neighborhoods combined with an equally sharp decline in the number of students living on campus (down 15% from 10,870 in 1989 to 9,240 in 1994).
- Increasingly tough competition from suburban-style shopping with easy parking. This is particularly evident in big box discount stores and improved neighborhood shopping (e.g., Big Bear) in surrounding areas. The availability of parking is a complex issue as convenient mass transit is non-existent and the area does not provide cost-competitive day-to-day goods and services. Consequently, as students are much more mobile than in the past (75% own cars), they will travel further for goods. This automobile dependence exacerbates the retail decline as well as adding to parking and traffic problems in the University District.
- The adverse impacts of well-meaning changes in parking and roads, including cutting off many access points to High Street, eliminating parking on High Street, and restricting non-resident parking in the neighborhood, which makes parking for retail more difficult and reduces the number of commuters walking across High Street (and sometimes shopping in the process).
- General deterioration in the appearance and cleanliness of the High Street strip, concerns for personal safety, panhandling and graffiti and the negative effects of an overconcentration of bars and fast food restaurants.

Market Analysis: Methodology and Findings

In spring of 1995 a market analysis was conducted of the study area's existing businesses and potential for new development. This analysis was comprised of two parts - interviews with existing merchants and a demand analysis to quantify market potential for new businesses and land uses.

Merchant Interviews: The interviews were conducted by Boulevard Strategies, a Columbus-based retail consulting firm. Individual interviews were conducted with the primary business owner or managers for 51 merchants in the study area. Topics covered in each interview included customer mix, employment and recruiting practices, competition and competitive advantages, square footage used in the operation, rent, sales performance, strengths and weaknesses of the University District as a business environment, and suggestions for improvement. The sample of merchants was not randomly generated and was intentionally weighted toward the District's most influential businesses in terms of longevity, size, and community involvement. However, the cross section of interviews did reflect a representative sample of businesses and trades operating within the University District. The complete findings from these interviews are contained in Results of Merchant Interviews in the University District. A summary of the major findings include:

- The typical merchant has been in business for approximately 13 years, and has been in their current location for 10 years. Typical size of their operations are approximately 2,000-2,400 square feet at a median rent of \$9.40/square foot.
- Nearly 80% of the merchants plan to make physical improvements or renovations to their businesses in the near future, primarily on the exterior. This includes modernizing storefronts, painting, providing new awnings, adding new entrances or windows, better lighting, dumpster fences, landscaping, and bicycle racks.
- Most of the merchants draw their business from within the University District, although approximately 33% draw on a regional basis. Students account for 65% of the typical merchant's sales, while faculty and staff make up 5%. The remaining 30% of sales is to non-student University District residents, alumni, parents, and other visitors. The median age range for the typical customer is 18 to 26.
- High Street merchants believe their competitive advantages include superior service, more selection or unique products, comfortable atmosphere, and high traffic locations.
- Median sales per square foot is \$150, a respectable but not outstanding indicator of performance. A total of 28% of the merchants interviewed are performing below \$100 per square foot, which indicates marginal viability. However, the majority of merchants (57%) believe they were doing better in 1995 than in 1994.
- Strengths of the area most often mentioned by the interview respondents included the size and diversity of the student market, diversity of businesses serving student needs, and the high levels of foot traffic. Other positive attributes cited by businesses included their association with The Ohio State University and the Wexner Center, diversity/sophistication of consumers in the area, the campus atmosphere, the sense of community among University District merchants, and the student labor force.
- Unfortunately, merchants indicated that the area has two weaknesses for every strength. Most highly rated problems included crime, vandalism, drugs, and under-age drinking. The second-ranking weakness is the poor tenant mix - too many fast food restaurants and drinking establishments resulting in a limited variety of stores types. Other problems cited included worsening conditions brought on by concentrations of low income housing, absentee landlords, traffic congestion, the lack of parking, and the difficulty in making deliveries and pickups in the area. Finally the poor appearance of the area as evidenced by trash, graffiti, broken windows, dirty sidewalks, and vacant storefronts were mentioned as other contributors to the area's difficulties as a business environment.
- New businesses suggested by the merchants included better quality/sit down type restaurants, offering a diversity of ethnic and American dining opportunities. The second-most suggested new businesses included clothing stores such as the Gap or the Limited to provide for more everyday needs of students and as an alternative to the oversupply of T-shirt shops. Other suggestions included better quality entertainment options such as video stores, cinemas, dance clubs, micro breweries, art galleries, live entertainers, spoken word performers, plays, and interactive arts.
- Finally, the merchants wanted to see action, change, and results--not just more research, analysis, and propaganda.

Demand Analysis: The demand analysis was developed by Robert Charles Lesser and Company, based on expenditure potential estimates for neighborhood and dorm residents. These estimates were developed by Boulevard Strategies using a proprietary model and demographics of the neighborhood, data from the Lantern, and national surveys regarding spending patterns of students living on campus. Faculty and staff expenditure estimates were derived from specific Ohio State University and national survey data. The results of this analysis indicate a demand for additional retail, and particularly retail providing goods for students, other residents of the District, faculty, staff, daily visitors, and employees that work within the area and are currently underserved. The potential was expanded to include attracting additional patrons from outside the area. A summary of this analysis by use includes:

Retail: Loss of retail sales dollars is extremely high in the University District. The following table summarizes the minimal amount of money currently spent in the University District by groups of potential customers:

\$.27 of every \$1.00 by neighborhood residents
 \$.33 of every \$1.00 by dormitory residents

\$.04 of every \$1.00 by faculty and staff

This is contrasted against healthy neighborhood commercial areas that typically capture \$.50 to \$.60 of every \$1.00 spent by residents and \$.10 to \$.15 for employees working in a given area. If the factors leading to the current decline of retail along High Street can be effectively addressed, even relatively modest increases in capture rates will generate new demand for substantial increases in retail space.

This will require not only physical and safety improvements, but also the development and inclusion of new retail formats into the District's retail centers. Although there is an oversupply of some types of larger format retailers in the Columbus area at large, there is still a deficit in closer-in urban areas such as the University Neighborhoods. Currently, an increasing portion of individual retail dollars go to stores that dominate their retail categories, which in turn provides cost-competitive goods. Access to more price-competitive goods effectively increases one's disposable income, in turn leaving more money for entertainment, home furnishing, or apparel purchase. To exclude these retailers from the University Neighborhoods will limit the area's potential for economic growth and improved affordability.

While a significant portion of new retail can be accommodated through upgrades to existing buildings (e.g., existing bars rehabilitated or replaced with different forms of entertainment), there exists enough demand to warrant a net increase in new retail users and square footage. Market demand analysis indicates the potential for:

- 70,000 - 90,000 square feet of recycled retail space, and
- 85,000 - 100,000 square feet of new retail over the next five years.

Continued discussions with local and national retail developers have indicated that these estimates may in fact be conservative.

Potential new store categories include avant-garde apparel and home furnishings catering to both the youth and urban resident market; casual restaurants that provide value price points and sit-down qualities; new bookstore/cafe formats; larger record stores; progressive and day-to-day apparel stores; office supplies; art, film, or second run theaters; and a broader and higher quality range of entertainment-oriented uses than currently offered. Consequently, accommodating new users as well as the types of stores recommended by existing merchants will require redevelopment of some existing commercial structures on High Street, given their current size and configuration. To create the larger spaces required by these users, complicated site assemblage and creative assemblage/financing techniques will also be necessary.

While significant potential for new retail space is warranted in the High Street corridor, neighborhood commercial centers demand is much more limited. Basic uses such as restaurants, cleaners, small groceries, etc. will need to be carefully developed as the market matures, and will require financial assistance in the initial phases of development to assure their success and long-term viability.

Office: The Ohio State University currently leases 115,000 square feet of space off campus, 42% of which has leases expiring by 1998. Highest rents currently paid are about \$14 to \$15 per square foot (full service), with no escalations or pass-throughs but on typically short lease terms (e.g., three years). This obvious potential tenant is supplemented by additional demand from tenants who may want to be proximate to the large student labor force, the university's significant research facilities, or to provide consulting opportunities for faculty. Examples of these types of users include telemarketing firms, law and design practices, or high tech software and medical development firms.

Based on these opportunities, the demand analysis projects a potential for approximately 70,000 square feet of new office space in the University Neighborhoods over the next five years to serve university uses now located off campus, as well as activities located in dormitory buildings that might be converted back to student housing. Additional demand of approximately 30,000 square feet for firms established by faculty or firms that want a location near the university is also a consideration.

One other very strong program element is a 10,000-15,000 square foot Ohio State Visitor's Center which could be incorporated into any new community gateway commercial development.

Physical Analysis: Methodology and Findings

A physical review of existing commercial facilities was conducted in the spring of 1995, and updated as testing of various revitalization alternatives developed. Reviews of existing buildings were completed by NBBJ, EDAA, Robert Charles Lesser and Company, and Campus Partners to assess the adaptive reuse potential of most existing structures along High Street. Assessments of Building Condition, Existing Land Use, and Building Character were documented in the inventory and analysis phase by NBBJ through a review of past studies and through windshield and walking surveys using generally accepted industry standards for building classification. The results of these analyses are documented in the ULI Briefing Book.

Buildings: High Street, between 5th and Northwood Avenues, is the area's predominant retail provider with over 625,000 square feet of retail businesses. While this is a significant amount of total space, the fact that it is aggregated from over 200+ separate spaces results in very inefficient floor plates and limited opportunities for users seeking larger buildings with contiguous square footage in the 3,000 - 5,000 sf

High Street: While the scale and texture of the buildings along High Street are reminiscent of a typical "main street" feel, there are few buildings that contribute significantly on their own to the overall character of the corridor. The one notable exception is the Newport Music Hall, which is both a major entertainment venue for the District as well as an architectural centerpiece. However, the graceful drama that recalls the bygone era of great theaters has been obscured by insensitive and inappropriate renovation.

Other sites, while not significant as architectural features, are an important part of the corridor for the business and neighborhood history they represent. Long's Bookstore and Larry's Bar are two such neighborhood institutions whose continued presence needs to be addressed as a part of any revitalization/redevelopment effort. Several large residential structures north of 15th Avenue have considerable architectural character, and should be considered for adaptive reuse as restaurants, bed and breakfasts, or simply residential apartments. While their architectural character has been obscured by commercial storefronts added over time, removal of these storefronts will provide both opportunities to widen the sidewalk (creating new open space elements along High Street), and concentrate the retail program into a critical mass consistent with Recommendation 15.1.4.

Finally, three residential complexes that provide rowhouse style apartments facing exterior courtyards are a unique building typology that should be explored for renovation and adaptive reuse. In sum total, this represents approximately 50% of the structures within the High Street Corridor that are worth further evaluation for adaptive reuse. The remaining 50% of the structures in the corridor are questionable for reuse potential when the cost of renovation or their ability to provide appropriately sized retail floor plates is considered.

Streetscape: The physical character of High Street is a limiting factor to the area's success. The narrow width sidewalks (from 12 to 8 feet) create negative impacts on both the vitality and appearance of High Street. When the narrow widths are coupled with street furnishings such as street trees, tree grates, trash cans, kiosks and light fixtures, effective pedestrian circulation is reduced even further to six feet, only wide enough for two people walking side by side. The high traffic levels within the corridor create a pedestrian environment that is overcrowded, unsafe, and overextended in terms of its ability to absorb wear and tear or trash generated by large traffic volumes.

The other negative impact of narrow sidewalks is the proportional relationship between the vertical building face and the horizontal ground plane. As a rule a 1:1 ratio should exist between the first story height and the pedestrian ground plane to create a proper setting for strolling comfort, allow for window shopping, provide proper visibility for retail signage, and establish an appropriate foreground for the building elevation.

The narrow sidewalk widths are further exacerbated by the lack of 'transparency' that many of the storefronts currently afford. Building and storefront transparency is the ability of a passing shopper to view into the store, or a display window. The larger the storefront glass and hence transparency, the more lively the street feel. This increased transparency also has the added psychological effect of making the sidewalk feel wider, because pedestrians can look through glass and into the store as opposed to feeling forced to walk against a solid wall. Currently, many buildings along High Street have chosen to board up or stucco over storefronts due to safety

concerns or low budget renovations. This has resulted in considerable new flat surfaces for graffiti and handbill litter, adding to the blighted and uninviting appearance of High Street.

High Street is also hampered by the closure of several east-west streets in the late 1980s. Closed to minimize conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists and automobiles turning into or exiting on these streets, the resulting "cul de sacs" lack maintenance, provide only limited parking, and effectively have cut off ease of circulation in and out of the neighborhood, further hampering retail vitality.

Finally, High Street, and its role and relationship to the neighborhood is limited by its "one dimensional" character. This is most visible as one turns the corner off of High Street into one of the neighborhood's east-west streets to find either the rear of the building, a vacant parking lot, or a residential structure.

Lane Avenue: Lane Avenue (west of High Street) is characterized by a mixture of residential uses, retail, and hotel facilities, catering predominantly to Ohio State students and visitors. The land uses divide most distinctly around Neil Avenue, with the character of the corridor east of Neil predominantly non-descript residential complexes built close to the street edge. Land use west of Neil is commercial, varies widely in building scale and depth of setback, on both the private sector side and Ohio State University side. As the proposed western gateway to the University District, Lane Avenue in its current condition contributes little to the community and requires aggressive revisions to both the roadway cross section and edge condition.

5th Avenue: 5th Avenue is characterized by vacant or semi-renovated residential, neighborhood commercial, and industrial buildings in a variety of commercial and light industrial uses. Within the corridor there are approximately nine commercial structures providing 45,000 square feet. The general condition of most buildings is fair to poor, and any new construction has been done in a manner of lowest cost and highest security. Consequently, the structures are both a blight on the 5th Avenue corridor and negative appearance on the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Commercial: Neighborhood commercial is scattered intermittently throughout the study area, with the two prime locations being a 40,000 square foot center at 18th Avenue and Fourth Street, and approximately 65,000 square feet of mixed uses located around the intersections of 11th/Chittenden Avenues and Summit/Fourth Streets. Approximately 15 structures are scattered throughout the study area, providing an estimated 18,000 square feet of commercial uses, primarily convenience commercial and neighborhood entertainment such as taverns or restaurants. While these buildings vary widely in condition and character, their predominant appearance is one of strong potential, but currently poorly maintained.

Programs and Concepts

High Street Centers of Activity: The Revitalization Plan proposes three activity centers along High Street as the main street's anchors to spur new activity and development within the entire corridor. These include an Entertainment/Retail center of 11th and High Street; an "Arts Gateway" to Ohio State at 15th and High Street; and a neighborhood commercial and expanded international village at Lane and High Street. These centers would be located approximately 1/4 mile apart to maximize people's willingness to park at one node and then walk to others. Each node should be differentiated in image, scale, and theme to meet varying market potential - while creating a synergy of uses and character that will provide the corridor with a unique identity, and attract a number of markets. Not surprisingly, likely store categories include tenants that cater to student's needs: progressive apparel and home furnishings, casual restaurants, bookstore cafes, CD stores, second run movie theaters; and a wide range of entertainment oriented uses of a higher caliber and diversity than the existing bars at 11th and High.

A second concept integral to these activity centers is linking the centers with smaller scale commercial/residential development. The linkages would be a combination of scattered site renovation or infill construction. Commercial development in these areas should "turn the corner" at cross streets, extending into the East Campus to provide opportunities for neighborhood services and retail users that cannot afford the more costly lease rates of a High Street address. Retail/service space would be located on the ground floors with high density housing or office on upper levels. This would bridge the High Street "commercial facade" to the lower intensity scale of the residential neighborhoods.

A third critical concept for High Street is the provision for structured parking and improvements to Pearl Street as the District's primary service corridor. Current estimates are that the corridor suffers from a deficit of approximately 2,000 parking spaces based on existing land uses. To alleviate the shortage, new garages are proposed at the three activity center locations to support new uses and help solve some of the current parking shortages. Pearl Street's primary function must be as a service alley, and improvements will involve upgrading the alley through land acquisition, utility relocation, and parking restrictions (see Chapters 12.0 and 14.0 for circulation and parking recommendations).

The fourth concept involves revisions to the current development standards as they relate to building setbacks, and retail appendages on older residential units that are now zoned for commercial use. The city of Columbus Ordinance No. 313-03 that requires a 65-foot setback from the centerline of High Street should be repealed, and replaced with an ordinance that requires a minimum 12-foot setback from the curb instead. The intent of the change is to allow for greater sidewalk widths in areas that are now too constrained. It is still the intent of the Revitalization Plan to maintain the current "street wall" on the east side of High Street to define the sidewalk edge where feasible, but encourage removal of cluttered storefronts appended onto residential structures. This will provide increased opportunities for new plazas and sidewalk cafes and allow the historic structures to be adaptively reused.

Additional improvements to High Street will involve the provision of increased crosswalk connections and new traffic signalization (see Chapters 12.0, 13.0).

The Revitalization Plan also recommends other shopping areas that might be developed or revitalized outside of the High Street/Lane Avenue areas. However, the demand analysis conducted for this study does not indicate a great deal of support for small retail areas scattered through the neighborhood. Market opportunities should be monitored regularly to determine whether there are opportunities for new neighborhood retail, and financial incentives should be drafted to support the most viable operations.

Locally Owned Business Retention and Encouragement: Existing merchants are an indispensable component of High Street's future. Considerable effort should be made to assist them in realizing a long-term place in the community's revitalization at the same time helping them to develop a more prosperous future. As the merchants interviewed for the Revitalization Plan recognized, a more market-responsive mix of stores, including some larger national and regional stores, will help all merchants, just as all the stores in a shopping center benefit from having desirable department stores and other anchors.

The Revitalization Plan recommends various new development and renovation projects along High Street. The relocation of certain businesses will be inevitable during stages of new construction or rehabilitation, but the city of Columbus' Commercial Revitalization Department, Campus Partners, and the UCBA should develop a relocation and business assistance program that will be a major component of any redevelopment proposal put before the City Council. Additionally, a portion of new and rehabilitated structures should include a percentage set-aside for locally owned and managed businesses.

A model program that should be reviewed is the Rouse Company's approach to Festival Marketplace development. Rouse recognizes the importance of blending national credit tenants to secure financing with locally owned businesses to ensure uniqueness in each of their developments. For this reason they typically provide business and financial assistance with locational support and dedicated amounts of square footage for local entrepreneurs that wish to establish businesses within the new development.

Business Improvement District

High Street Special Improvement District: The critical administrative action in support of a revitalized High Street will be the formation of a High Street Special Improvement District. In recent times, more and more urban businesses are privatizing traditionally publicly provided services. Believing that these services are essential to a commercial precincts' economic vitality, retail operator and landowners are paying for these services as a cost of business. The payments are often seen as common area maintenance charges paid by shopping center tenants. Based on an analysis of 13 assessment financed districts by the Urban Land Institute, they all have several elements in common:

- The initiative comes from business leaders who seek common services beyond those that the City can provide.
- The City determines the boundaries, approves the annual budget and financing strategy, and determines what services may be provided.
- Business leaders shape the annual budget, hire staff, let contracts, and generally oversee operations.

Establishing the High Street Special Improvement District: Recent Ohio enabling legislation has created the mechanism for establishing Special Improvement Districts (SID) within targeted areas. The economic vitality of urban commercial zones is often linked directly to issues such as crime, visual appearance, and parking management. The SID concept typically involves the privatization of services that traditionally would fall on the public sector, paid for by the business owners. The responsibilities of the operator designated to provide services to High Street would include security, trash pick-up, snow removal, street cleaning, street furniture and tree maintenance, handbill and graffiti removal, and parking management. Other non-traditional services include "soft policing" of aggressive panhandlers and the daily arrangement and pick-up of street furniture.

Based upon Ohio law, establishment of a SID requires a petition signed by owners of either: (1) at least 60% of the front footage of property abutting any street or alley in the proposed SID, or (2) at least 75% of the property area in the proposed SID. The City Council will then need to approve the articles of incorporation for the SID and will levy a special assessment to pay for the costs of an initial plan. At that point, a Board of Trustees will be established for the SID, with each property owner having one vote. The Board of Trustees will proceed to adopt one or more plans for public improvements and/or public services, including the assessment method that will be used. After receiving comments from the City Council and Mayor, such plans need to be submitted in the form of petitions signed by owners of either: (1) at least 60% of the front footage of property that would be assessed, or (2) at least 75% of the property area that would be assessed. The plans then need to be approved by the City Council. Assessments can be levied: (1) by a percentage of the tax assessment, (2) in proportion to the benefits that each property will receive, or (3) on proportion to the front footage abutting an improvement. A SID can be dissolved or services plan repealed with a vote by the property owners.

One of the unique opportunities for developing an effective High Street SID is the role that Ohio State can play, given the significant amount of property that it owns within the High Street Corridor. By voluntarily agreeing to participate in the High Street SID, the organization can get an immediate and effective boost to its operating income and momentum of effectiveness.

While the services typically provided by Special Improvement Districts vary, most SIDs throughout the country have the primary objective of promoting clean and safe commercial settings. In the previously referenced analysis of 13 SIDs, over 50% of the operating funds go toward either improved cleaning or security of the respective Districts.

A summary of the potential services that the High Street SID should provide are:

- **Security** - additional foot patrol officers and for security during special events.
- **Enhancement of Public Services** - more frequent and higher levels of trash pick-up, snow removal, street cleaning, street furniture and tree maintenance, handbill and graffiti removal, and parking management. Other services should include daily placement and maintenance of moveable street furnishings to improve the user friendliness of the District's public spaces.
- **Blighting Social Issues** - Addressing and soft policing such problems as panhandling and homelessness which reinforce the perception of the area as unsafe.
- **Management Issues:** Tenant mix and merchandising skills, as well as business management programs developed in conjunction with Ohio State's Business School. Events programming and support to attract people to the District and make them aware of the area's offerings should be coordinated with a comprehensive marketing campaign managed by the SID to promote High Street as a unique shopping venue.

Design Continuity

All new commercial construction and rehabilitation along High Street should comply with a set of established design guidelines developed to create an active and vibrant retail area, while also protecting the historic scale and texture of the corridor.

Design guidelines and design review processes help create or maintain the unique, unified identity of an area to which they are applied. Currently, design guidelines exist for several areas within the University District. Under the heading of residential, the University Area Appearance Review Board or the City's Historic Resources Commission provides the most comprehensive and effective method for limiting inappropriate design. The Ohio State University has addressed its built environment through the adoption of design guidelines and a new campus master plan in 1996.

However, commercial and specifically retail uses are severely lacking design controls. As a result, past and even recent renovations continue to add to the area's blighted appearance. In the merchant interviews conducted as a part of this study, over 80% indicated they plan some form of renovation or upgrade to their properties or stores in the near future. If properly directed, this level of private sector improvement could have an immediate positive impact on the appearance of High Street. Consequently, commercial design guidelines should be developed to be address three primary audiences:

- **Merchants/Owners** - who may be interested in changing their storefronts, but are not sure how to process the plans or what is acceptable from a design standpoint. The city of Columbus' Neighborhood Design Assistance Center, as a facilitator for the Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization projects, could be a valuable resource for owners and merchants trying to assess their options under these guidelines.
- **Design and Construction Professionals** - who work with merchants or owners to construct a new building or renovate an existing building and need to know the basic principles that should be followed and addressed as part of the final design.
- **University Area Review Board** - which should have review capacity for proposed projects in the District and will interpret the guidelines for each submittal.

The pedestrian feel of many successful retail streets is largely due to the fact that they have evolved over a period of many years. The combination of time and architectural perspectives results in a rich fabric of building colors, materials, and styles. High Street, with its traditional main street character, is similar in its evolution. Within the core area between 11th Avenue and Lane, the scale of the buildings (often two- to three-story), the building materials which are primarily brick and stone, the diversity of architectural styles and forms, and the amount of open space that exists between some buildings (especially the rowhouse clusters), in front of buildings (residential structures converted over the retail), or as an 'apron' to the campus on the west side of High Street all combine to create the unique feel that is High Street in the University Neighborhoods.

The design guidelines need to provide standards that blend new commercial development with rehabilitation of existing structures. This is especially true when one considers that many of the program requirements that national retailers use may be difficult to achieve if the guidelines simply try to replicate the existing building patterns that currently exist. As such, a balance will need to be struck between ensuring that new businesses can construct viable and operationally functional structures and respecting the integrity and historic patterns of High Street. The guidelines should have three objectives:

- *To ensure appropriate rehabilitation of existing structures* that contribute significantly to the character and feel of High Street or the District in general.
- For structures that do not contribute significantly to the character of High Street or are obsolete in terms of marketplace, *new construction or infill should be designed to continue historic building patterns.*
- For newly identified commercial and service sites outside of the High Street Corridor, *new construction or adaptive re-use of existing structures* should respect the current scale and patterns of the adjoining neighborhoods, but the guidelines should not be so restrictive that viable new investment is unattainable.

Requirements: The guidelines should address, as a minimum, the following seven major categories:

1. Site Development Standards
2. Building Height and Massing
3. Building materials

4. Storefronts and Entries
5. Awnings, lighting, and building features
6. Signage
7. Street amenities (furnishings, landscaping, paving, etc.)

Core Value #6: The University District shall accomplish its larger civic goals through the active participation of community individuals and agencies.

Chapter 16.0 addresses the key stakeholders required to implement the Plan. The success of the community participation effort embodied in this document depends on the active participation of concerned individuals and University District Organizations, university trustees, faculty and staff, Campus Partners, all members of the City departments that will interface with the programs designated herein, and the Mayor and City Council of the city of Columbus.

16.0 STAKEHOLDER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Objectives

Implementing the Revitalization Plan's recommendations is critical for change, but also to demonstrate that the planning and study effort has produced something different than past efforts. No one entity can accomplish the monumental task of implementing the Revitalization Plan. Instead it must be a partnership of many different organizations, agencies and individuals.

The following objectives address the implementation of the Revitalization Plan:

Objective 1: Provide clear and consistent leadership for the revitalization effort.

Objective 2: Ensure adequate resources of funding and staffing for the long-term duration of the project.

Objective 3: Ensure appropriate use of existing organizations within the community.

B. Policies and Recommendations

Policy 16.1: The Ohio State University and the city of Columbus need to provide consistent and long-term leadership for the revitalization effort.

Recommendation 16.1.1: The President of The Ohio State University and the Mayor of Columbus need to execute a memorandum of agreement committing to roles and financial commitments for the first five years of the revitalization effort.

Policy 16.2: Campus Partners needs to maintain a central role in the revitalization effort as the prime catalyst or facilitator for implementation of key projects and programs.

Recommendation 16.2.1: Campus Partners should remain a separate entity outside of The Ohio State University organizational structure.

Recommendation 16.2.2: The Campus Partners Board of Trustees must become actively engaged in the revitalization process by providing both review and approval of Campus Partner's programs, as well as championing the Revitalization Plan within the community.

Recommendation 16.2.3: Other funding sources for Campus Partners operations should be sought such as foundation grants, and operating funds or staff loans, from the city of Columbus through the initial years of the revitalization efforts.

Recommendation 16.2.4: Campus Partners News needs to be continued and expanded as one of the Neighborhoods' main communications, public relations and marketing tools..

Policy 16.3: Neighborhood Organizations should be recognized and supported for the contributions they can make to the revitalization effort.

Recommendation 16.3.1: The University District Organization should assume the role as the umbrella organization for all neighborhood groups active within the University District.

Recommendation 16.3.2: The University District Organization should play an active role alongside Campus Partners in promoting homeownership programs, as well as the desirability of living in the Neighborhoods.

Recommendation 16.3.3: The University Community Business Association should play an active role in the development of the Special Improvement District for High Street, as well as assist Campus Partners in the revitalization and redevelopment efforts for High Street.

Recommendation 16.3.4: The University Area Commission should continue its leadership through promotion of the revitalization proposals and advocating for constructive change that will be of long-term benefit to the community.

Recommendation 16.3.5: The aforementioned, as well as other organizations (not specifically identified), should be encouraged and welcomed to the revitalization effort for the specific talents and energies they can bring to the process. Specific proposals for assuring adequate funding for these organizations should be developed as a part of the Implementation Strategy.

Policy 16.4: Discussion of issues and projects must continue among residents, agencies, and the university and to ensure accountability for planning and delivering services to area residents.

Recommendation 16.4.1: Develop a "Dialogue Bridge" as an innovative communication technique to establish, enhance, and sustain partnerships with community residents, the university, the city and Campus Partners.

Policy 16.5: The Revitalization Plan represents the beginning of the planning process, not the end.

Recommendation 16.5.1: More study needs to be conducted in the Neighborhoods to fully enact some of the Revitalization Plan's recommendations. These include:

- Baseline code violation study in the East, North and South Campus as well as the Indianola Terrace neighborhoods
- District level plan for the High Street Corridor that more specifically addresses land use, traffic and parking from 9th Avenue to Lane Avenue.
- District-level plan development for the East Campus Neighborhood that looks at problem properties, parking and open space options
- District level plan for South Campus concurrent with the Ohio State University's planning effort.
- Design Guidelines to High Street

C. Required Commitments

Without enduring commitment by either The Ohio State University or the city of Columbus, the goals of the Revitalization Plan will not be achieved. Both entities must present themselves as a synchronized, committed, implementation authority before any other prospective entities can be expected to fully commit to the revitalization effort. Active cooperation and participation should be formally represented in Memorandum of Agreement to be signed by the Mayor and Ohio State's President. Equally important will be the need for

regular vocal championing of the revitalization initiatives and non-stop campaigning for financial and organizational commitments by Federal, State, and private sector contributors. Specific requirements include:

The City's commitment must begin at the highest level, the Mayor and City Council. They must formally adopt the Revitalization Plan and direct City departments and divisions to support its actions, provide the necessary resources, and initiate the necessary policy and administrative changes required to accomplish its objectives.

Additionally, the City needs to assure that investments made in capital improvements are judicious and prudent but not short sighted. Each project should be evaluated for its ability to attract new long term private investment to the area, while helping to resolve immediate problems.

Ohio State University's commitment must begin with the President and Ohio State Board of Trustees, who must be visible in their commitment to the Revitalization Plan, and assure the entire university works to constructively participate in the implementation process. Specific actions that must be directed include:

- Ensuring that faculty heads are informed of the opportunities presented to them for research, training, learning, and community service in the Revitalization Plan's Educational Excellence program, and subsequently securing their participation.
- Committing funds necessary to initiate the faculty and staff homeownership incentive programs.
- Ensuring that academic and academic support units at all levels work to accomplish the objectives of the Revitalization Plan by working with the specific recommendations. Where it is determined that specific actions cannot be achieved, they should work constructively with Campus Partners to modify the actions to achieve the objectives.

Campus Partners should assume the role as central facilitator for implementation. The organization and its staff should act as the primary point of coordination between the community, Ohio State, the city of Columbus, and private sector participants. Campus Partners should be proactive in its mission to see that the Revitalization Plan's objectives are met, while ensuring that the sum of the Revitalization Plan's many projects and recommendations continue to add up to a solution truly greater than their individual efforts. Campus Partners' most important responsibility will be to coordinate the successful implementation of renovation and redevelopment projects, performing such tasks as coordinating meetings between community groups and prospective developers, attending and supporting projects at public meetings, and assisting in the public approvals processes.

The city of Columbus and The Ohio State University need to follow through on policy modifications as well as provide the necessary financial incentives or project investment to attract greater levels of private sector investment.

Community Organizations can play a valuable role in developing and refining the Implementation Strategy, through a series of committees focused on realizing specific projects and recommendations as prioritized in the Strategy document. These committees should combine the talents and knowledge of residents, community leaders, agency staffers and university officials.

Dialogue Bridge: A Dialogue Bridge will be developed to establish, enhance, and sustain partnerships with community residents, the university, Campus Partners, and the University Neighborhoods, including human service providers. The Dialogue Bridge will provide a forum for continued assessment of community strengths, capacities, and gifts as well as a community forum for planning, goal setting, and accountability. The Dialogue Bridge will provide opportunities to support development activities by all parties as they seek external dollars and opportunities to learn about and from each other.

D. Conclusion

Achieving the proposed vision for the University Neighborhoods as a city within a city that is safe, viable and diverse can only be accomplished by concurrently improving High Street, raising levels of home ownership, reducing both the reality and perception of crime, securing the active involvement of the university's staff, faculty, and students, and improving the competitive position of the student core area.

The Revitalization Plan lays out specific recommendations to accomplish these tasks, by creating both physical and programmatic changes in the neighborhoods. Revising both the primary and secondary circulation system creates a new clarity and opportunity for residential areas to redevelop. Improved, expanded or new parks, all connected by a logical circuit of greenways and bike routes will improve both the visual quality of the area, the perception of open space and the ability to use transportation modes beyond the automobile. Finally, the recognition and formalization of neighborhood units that share similar concerns as well as zoning and policy considerations, provide a platform for grass-roots organizations to seize back their neighborhoods and take control of their long term destiny.

These physical improvements are balanced with specific programs such as community policing, comprehensive youth involvement programs and stronger cooperation between The Ohio State University and city of Columbus Police, all directed at improving the perception and reality of safety. Specific incentive programs for homeownership, modeled after successful programs throughout the country, will bring a dramatic level of private investment into the neighborhoods for little to no cost. Public service improvements, some of which are already underway, will require significant political leadership and community involvement to effect change. Finally, an innovative approach to leveraging the resources and talent of Ohio State and to an expanded definition of 'education' will provide the missing link between one-dimensional bricks and mortar improvements and the truly long term redevelopment success that so many other communities have sought.

In summary, the problems facing the University Neighborhoods are not insurmountable. However, the momentum of decline is accelerating toward a rapid downward spiral. Successfully turning this tide will require a multi-layered approach...one that utilizes a diverse group of resources, sponsors, and clear actions all focused toward holistic redevelopment of the University Neighborhoods as a unique, vital urban community.

GLOSSARY

Business Incubator - A program designed to assist in the development of new businesses in the University District by providing office space, support services, etc.

Campus Collaborative for Educational Excellence - A consortium of colleges and academic units at Ohio State University which includes faculty and graduate students from more than 30 different colleges and units of the University.

Campus Partners - A non-profit organization established in January 1995 to accomplish two priorities - to develop a comprehensive neighborhood Revitalization Plan and Implementation Strategy and to actively promote projects and programs that can have an immediate, positive impact on the neighborhoods.

Core Value - Firmly held beliefs that establish continuity between all future actions and provide the organizing elements for all recommendations and actions. Core values were shaped by public input and responses to the revitalization plan.

Defensible Space - Based on the concept of crime prevention through environmental design, defensible space creates zones of greater control and surveillance of personal space and property, leading to improved personal safety

East Campus - A predominantly rental neighborhood located east of Pearl Avenue, south of Woodruff Avenue, north of 11th Avenue, and west of Summit Street.

Festival Marketplace - Mixed use development that combines national and local retailers in an entertainment environment.

Greenways - Linear corridors, often streets, which are planned to receive landscape, pedestrian and other upgrades.

Pre-Service Students - Students in training.

Special Improvement District - An assessment district funded by district businesses. Funding provides security patrols, enhanced public services and management programs for businesses within the district.

Storage Parking - Long term parking designed for individuals who do not need their cars on a daily basis

Transfer of Development Rights - A program which designates certain neighborhoods as sender zones for development credits (additional units) and certain neighborhoods as receiver zones for these additional credits. This effectively reduces the density in the sender zones and increases the density in the receiver zones. Sometimes referred to as Development Rights Transfer or TDR.

University Area Improvement Task Force - A task force established in January 1994 to respond to growing concerns regarding the quality of life in the University District.

University District - A 2.5 square mile planning area directly north of downtown Columbus. The District encompasses 1,500 acres bounded by Glen Echo Ravine to the north, the Conrail Corridor to the east, 5th Avenue to the south, and the Olentangy River to the west.

University Neighborhoods - A subset of the University District, and the subject of the Revitalization Plan, encompassing similar boundaries to the University District but not including the area north of Northwood Avenue or the area south of King and west of Wall Street.

University District Overlay - A zoning district adopted in 1992, which overlays the University District and increases developer requirements for design appropriateness and limits density.

University District Organization - An organization of organizations providing an umbrella for all neighborhood and community organizations in the University District.

University Community Business Association - The local business organization for all businesses within the University District.

University Area Commission - A publicly elected body which acts as an advisory body to the City of Columbus on planning and zoning issues within the University District.

West Campus - The area of the Ohio State University campus located west of the Olentangy River.

ACRONYMS

ACE - Active Criminal Eviction Project
CCP - Community Crime Patrol
CCP - Columbus Comprehensive Plan
CDP - Columbus Division of Police
CEO - Code Enforcement Officers
CEP - Comprehensive Education Program
CHMA - Columbus Housing Management Authority
CHP - Columbus Housing Partnership
CO - Certificate of Occupancy
COA - Certificate of Appropriateness
COTA - Central Ohio Transit Authority
CSA - Community Service Aide
CWEP - County Work Experience Program
EZ-SEP - Enterprise Zone Subsidized Employment Program
FAR - Floor Area Ratio
GIS - Geographic Information System
HUD - Housing and Urban Development (Federal agency)
MCC - Mortgage Credit Certificate
MRB - Mortgage Revenue Bond
NECKO - A neighborhood bounded by Neil, Eighth, Cannon and King
NDC - Northside Development Corporation
ODOT - Ohio Department of Transportation
OSU - Ohio State University
OZ - Overlay Zone
SCAT - Street Crime Attack Team
SEP - Subsidized Employment Program
SID - Special Improvement District
TDR - Transfer of Development Rights
UCBA - University Community Business Association
UDO - University District Organization
ULI - Urban Land Institute

BIBLIOGRAPHY

University District

University Community Business Association, *Block Maps*, UCBA, (date unknown).
Office of Business Administration, Ohio State University, *Capital Improvements Plan*, Ohio State University, July, 1993.
City of Columbus, Division of Planning, *Capital Improvements Needs Assessment*, City of Columbus, November, 1993.

City of Columbus, Department of Development, *Columbus Comprehensive Plan*, City of Columbus, December, 1993.

University District Organization: *Community Directions*, University District Organization, 1986.

University District Organization, *Draft Proposal to Designate the University District as a Special Parking Area*, City of Columbus, July, 1984.

OSU City & Regional Planning 853: *General Plan for the University Area*, Ohio State University, Department of City & Regional Planning, March, 1994.

Christoforidis, Alexander; Fani, Judy; Huber, Stephanie; Khan, Arif; Melican, Peggy; Van Otten, Eric: *High Street Corridor Redevelopment Plan*, Ohio State University Department of City and Regional Planning, April, 1993.

(Author Unknown), *The High Street Corridor Vision*. (Publisher and date unknown).

Chance Management Advisors, Inc., *Central Campus Traffic and Parking Study*, Ohio State University, October, 1993.

Habash, Matthew: *Memorandum on The University Area Improvement Issues*, City of Columbus, May, 1994.

UCBA, *Proposals for Change*, UCBA, October, 1990.

OSU Department of City and Regional Planning: *Strategies to Enhance the Quality of the High Street Commercial Strip*, [Publisher], August, 1985.

Urban Land Institute, Advisory Services Panel: *ULI Panel Report: Columbus, Ohio*, Urban Land Institute, March, 1992.

University Area Improvement Task Force: *Report*, The Ohio State University, June, 1994.

University District Organization, *University Area Parking and Alley Improvement Report*, City of Columbus, 1979.

Urban Land Institute, Advisory Services Panel: *Campus Partners, Columbus, Ohio: recommendations for the Revitalization of the University District Neighborhoods*, Urban Land Institute, July, 1995.

University District Organization, *University Area Plan*, City of Columbus, August, 1978.

University Area Commission: *University Area Vacancies Study*, University Area Commission, November, 1992.

City of Columbus Division of Planning, *University District Planning Study*, City of Columbus, February, 1991.

City of Columbus, Department of Development, *University/High Street Report*, City of Columbus, 1976.

Special/Business Improvement Districts

Houston, Lawrence O., Jr.: "Betting on BID's," Urban Land, June, 1994.

Knies, Scott: "Creating a Downtown Association from Scratch," IDA Special Report, May, 1990.

Martin, Douglas: "Districts to Improve Business Proliferate," New York Times, March 25, 1994.

International Downtown Association: "Downtown Management Districts: An Overview," Business Improvement Districts, International Downtown Association, August, 1995.

Editorial Staff, The Philadelphia Enquirer: "Success Story," The Philadelphia Enquirer, December 9, 1994, p. A22.

Pierce, Neal R.: "With a lot of help, Times Square bouncing back," Raleigh News & Observer, February 17, 1994, p. 18A.

Zoning

Lassar, Terry Jill: *Carrots & Sticks: New Zoning Downtown*, Urban Land Institute, 1989.

City of Columbus, *Zoning Ordinance*.